



No 9326. 73015



GIVEN BY

---





82d Congress }  
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

HEARINGS  
BEFORE THE  
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION  
ON  
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION



SEPTEMBER 30, OCTOBER 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,  
11, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



HEARINGS  
BEFORE THE  
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION  
ON  
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION



SEPTEMBER 30, OCTOBER 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,  
11, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1952

51

**PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION**

PHILIP B. PERLMAN, *Chairman*

EARL G. HARRISON, *Vice Chairman*

MSGT. JOHN O'GRADY

REV. THADDEUS F. GULLIXSON

CLARENCE E. PICKETT

ADRIAN S. FISHER

THOMAS C. FINUCANE

HARRY N. ROSENFELD, *Executive Director*



## REQUEST FOR TRANSMITTAL

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C., October 23, 1952.*

HON. PHILIP B. PERLMAN,  
*Chairman, President's Commission on  
Immigration and Naturalization,  
Executive Office, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PERLMAN: I am informed that the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization has held hearings in a number of cities and has collected a great deal of information concerning the problems of immigration and naturalization.

Since the subject of immigration and naturalization requires continuous congressional study, it would be very helpful if this committee could have the transcript of your hearings available for its study and use, and for distribution to the Members of Congress.

If this record is available, will you please transmit it to me so that I may be able to take the necessary steps in order to have it printed for the use of the committee and Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

## REPLY TO REQUEST

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON  
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,  
*Washington, October 27, 1952.*

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Pursuant to the request in your letter of October 23, 1952, we shall be happy to make available to you a copy of the transcript of the hearings held by this Commission. We shall transmit the record to you as soon as the notes are transcribed.

The Commission held 30 sessions of hearings in 11 cities scattered across the entire country. These hearings were scheduled as a means of obtaining some appraisal of representative and responsible views on this subject. The Commission was amazed, and pleased, at the enormous and active interest of the American people in the subject of immigration and naturalization policy.

Every effort was made to obtain the opinions of all people who might have something to contribute to the Commission's consideration. All shades of opinion and points of views were sought and heard. The response was very heavy, and the record will include the testimony and statements of some 600 persons and organizations.

This record, we believe, includes some very valuable information, a goodly proportion of which has not hitherto been available in discussions of immigration and naturalization. It is of great help to the Commission in performing its duties. We hope that this material will be useful to your committee, to the Congress, and to the country.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. PERLMAN, *Chairman.*

# CONTENTS

---

## Sessions:

### New York, N. Y.:

- First: September 30, 1952, morning session.
- Second: September 30, 1952, evening session.
- Third: October 1, 1952, morning session.
- Fourth: October 1, 1952, evening session.

### Boston, Mass.:

- Fifth: October 2, 1952, morning session.
- Sixth: October 2, 1952, evening session.

### Cleveland, Ohio:

- Seventh: October 6, 1952, morning session.
- Eighth: October 6, 1952, evening session.

### Detroit, Mich.:

- Ninth: October 7, 1952, morning session.
- Tenth: October 7, 1952, evening session.

### Chicago, Ill.:

- Eleventh: October 8, 1952, morning session.
- Twelfth: October 8, 1952, evening session.
- Thirteenth: October 9, 1952, morning session.
- Fourteenth: October 9, 1952, evening session.

### St. Paul, Minn.:

- Fifteenth: October 10, 1952, morning session.
- Sixteenth: October 10, 1952, evening session.

### St. Louis, Mo.:

- Seventeenth: October 11, 1952, morning session.
- Eighteenth: October 11, 1952, evening session.

### San Francisco, Calif.:

- Nineteenth: October 14, 1952, morning session.
- Twentieth: October 14, 1952, evening session.

### Los Angeles, Calif.:

- Twenty-first: October 15, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-second: October 15, 1952, evening session.

### Atlanta, Ga.:

- Twenty-third: October 17, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-fourth: October 17, 1952, evening session.

### Washington, D. C.:

- Twenty-fifth: October 27, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-sixth: October 27, 1952, evening session.
- Twenty-seventh: October 28, 1952, morning session.
- Twenty-eighth: October 28, 1952, evening session.
- Twenty-ninth: October 29, 1952, morning session.
- Thirtieth: October 29, 1952, evening session.

### Appendix: Special studies.

## Indexes:

- Persons heard or who submitted statements by session and order of appearance.
- Organizations represented by persons heard or by submitted statements.
- Persons heard or who submitted statements by alphabetical arrangement of names.
- Subject matter.

(Page numbers may be obtained from indexes)



# HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

---

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1952

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

ATLANTA, GA.

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization met at 9:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in courtroom 416, grand-jury room, Old Post Office Building, Atlanta, Ga., Hon. Philip B. Perlman (chairman) presiding.

Present: Chairman Philip B. Perlman, and the following Commissioners: Mr. Thomas G. Finucane, Dr. Clarence E. Pickett, Msgr. John O'Grady.

Also present: Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will please come to order.

Perhaps in opening this hearing I should state that this Commission appointed by the President in the early part of September has recently been engaged in holding hearings throughout the United States. We have had hearings in New York, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Paul, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

After this hearing we are going back to Washington and within a week or so we are going to have a series of hearings, at least three, which will be devoted to hearing testimony from individuals and representatives of national organizations. Some of those organizations have been represented in the hearings we have had throughout the country, but some of them wish to advise the Commission as to the viewpoint of their national organizations at their headquarters in Washington.

It ought to be understood and understood emphatically that the Commission is not taking any position at these hearings with respect to the immigration laws or the laws that affect naturalization or denaturalization. It is not taking any position at any of these hearings. It is our purpose only to obtain information, and we are collecting that information so that after we finish the hearings we will be enabled to examine it and to reach conclusions and make recommendations as to what, in our opinion, is for the best interest of the Nation; and also, in doing that, we will have an idea as to what is the sentiment of the people of the country as expressed by individuals and organizations who are interested in the subject matter. So, it should be clearly understood that the Commission is just here for the purpose of seeking information.

It is our responsibility and under the President's Executive order we are required to make a report to the President by the 1st of January

1953. We are not committed to any viewpoint. We are simply trying to find out what the people of the country think and what individuals and the organizations that are especially interested in the subject matter recommend as the proper policy for the country.

We have had before us individuals and representatives from a number of organizations who are perfectly satisfied with the existing legislation and who recommend that no changes be made, and that we recommend that no changes be made; on the other hand, we have heard individuals and representatives from a number of organizations, and university professors who advise us that in their opinion there are grave mistakes that have existed for many years in our immigration laws, and that some of those mistakes were carried over in the recently enacted legislation, and that some of them, in their opinion, were made somewhat more detrimental than they were in the past. Those, of course, are the opinions of various witnesses we have heard.

It should be understood that we are here in order to give the people of this area an opportunity to tell us, if they will, what they think about the present situation as expressed in the existing immigration rules and regulations and laws, and whether in their opinion there should be any changes made, and what nature the changes should be and, assuming any changes are recommended, in what direction they should go.

Of course, you may understand that this Commission has no legislative authority; all we can do is to make a report on our conclusions after gathering information. That report will go to the President, and the President may accept it, reject it, or refuse to adopt it; and, assuming he approves the report, then the only thing the President can do, either this President or the succeeding one, is ask Congress to make changes if any are recommended, or to continue the legislation unchanged, if that is the viewpoint that is submitted.

In the last analysis it is within the prerogative of the Congress and the Congress alone that will determine the questions we shall discuss today.

Now, the first person we have here on our schedule today is Dr. Herman L. Turner. Is Dr. Turner here?

#### STATEMENT OF REV. HERMAN L. TURNER, PASTOR, COVENANT PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ATLANTA, GA.

Dr. TURNER. I am Dr. Herman L. Turner, pastor of the Covenant Presbyterian Church, Atlanta, Ga.

With your permission, I should like to read a prepared statement and submit for incorporation in the record the Report of the Joint Committee on Resettlement of Displaced Persons presented at the meeting of the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in New York City this past May.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Dr. TURNER. The Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., at the meeting of its one hundred and sixty-fourth general assembly in New York City in May 1952, heard a report from the Joint Committee on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons. The joint committee was organized to coordinate the thinking and to spearhead the activity of our church (Presbyterian, U. S. A.) in bearing its share of responsibility for the millions of displaced persons left stranded by the war, under a pro-

gram of immigration authorized by the DP Act of 1946. The General Assembly of 1949 gave its endorsement to this emergency action.

The churches of my communion across the country have responded in an unusual way to this DP program. Dr. Charles T. Leber, chairman, the Joint Committee on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons, in his report to the one hundred and sixty-fourth general assembly stated: "We can now report that we have resettled more DP's than any other denomination (except Lutherans, who carried through an exceedingly large program for their own people) \* \* \*. It still remains true (as reported last year) that over 90 percent of our DP's have made most satisfactory resettlements and are already making fine contributions to the life of their several communities, not only economically but culturally and spiritually."

Dr. Leber further commented in his report: "Also additional legislation now pending may open the way to 'cleaning up' the DP situation in Europe and so bring us an allotment of several hundred more before the end of 1952. Beyond this, our church can never again be unaware of immigrants in our communities. Nor can we again be unmindful of the stateless, homeless, hopeless refugees—50,000,000 of them at present throughout the world. Because of this prospect for the future, this committee has been regularized as a committee of the general council, and its name has been changed to Committee on Resettlement Service of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and has been instructed by the general council to enlarge its function to include services to refugees."

I was a commissioner to the one hundred and sixty-fourth general assembly, and registered a favorable vote in behalf of the recommendations submitted by Dr. Leber's committee. This one is particular:

1. "That special encouragement and leadership be given to local pastors and congregations in taking responsibility for the social and spiritual welfare of resettled families; that, in order to further understanding of the psychological and sociological factors in homelessness, migration, and resettlement, the fullest possible use be made of discussion groups, platform, visual aid, church press, and other media."

A recent trip to Europe revealed the sameness about people regardless of where they live. They eat, drink, wear clothes, live in houses, work and trade, mix and mingle, love and hate. They have their churches, schools, and hospitals. They respond to the needs of old people and little children. They want security, peace, and happiness. Selfishness, greed, suspicion, fear, and lack of understanding which hinder progress in America are the same forces that hinder progress in Europe and other sections of the world.

The church of Jesus Christ has a positive responsibility in this whole matter of caring for the homeless and destitute millions. It is a moral responsibility that cannot be evaded by the church of this generation.

My hasty perusal of papers on United States immigration and naturalization policy reveals that our quota system should be more flexible; we should do something about the devastating effects of families being separated for long periods of time without reason or process, and also pass legislation looking toward the revision of our immigration and naturalization laws that will conform with our democratic tradition and with our heritage as a defender of human rights.

(The Report of the Joint Committee on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons, presented at the one hundred and sixty-fourth general assembly of the Presbyterian Church, is as follows:)

#### MINUTES

##### RESETTLEMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Report of the Joint Committee on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons was presented through its chairman, Rev. Charles T. Leber, and received. Pending the adoption of the recommendations, the general assembly was addressed by Rev. Harold H. Henderson, secretary of the committee; Mrs. J. H. Mason, of the Fairmount Presbyterian Church, Cleveland Heights, Ohio; and Rev. Alexander Nagy, whose remarks were interpreted by Rev. Joseph B. Balazs. The report was approved and its recommendations adopted as follows:

##### ORIGIN

In 1948 this Joint Committee on Resettlement of Displaced Persons was formed by representatives of the three boards, national, foreign, and Christian education, co-opted by the executive secretaries of the respective boards as an emergency measure. Representatives of the National Council of Presbyterian Men and the National Council of Women's Organizations were added.

##### PURPOSE

The joint committee was organized to coordinate the thinking and to spearhead the activity of our church in bearing its share of responsibility for the millions of displaced persons left stranded by the war, under a program of immigration authorized by the DP Act of 1948.

##### VALIDATION

The general assembly of 1949 gave its endorsement to this emergency action and in July 1949 the general council authorized the committee to file a blanket assurance for 2,000 DP families. The 1950 general assembly authorized an additional blanket of 1,000 units, making a total of 3,000 units or possibly 7,000 individual DP's which our church would undertake to resettle.

##### ADMINISTRATION

In May 1949 the committee placed three men in the field to secure resettlement "assurances"; namely, Rev. Kenneth Campbell of the Pacific coast, Rev. Harold Henderson in the Midwest, and Rev. Edward Williams on the Eastern seaboard. In July 1949 the Reverend James H. Nicol was called as executive secretary to take charge of the New York office. In November 1949 Rev. Verne Fletcher was appointed as our representative overseas to select our DP's for us. On December 1, Mr. Henderson was called to take the place of Dr. Nicol, resigned. Assurances began to pour into the office so that by May 1950 the committee had in hand assurances for more than 2,000 families; but at that time less than 100 DP's had arrived. Security restrictions, made by Congress, held up the Hungarian Reformed DP's to whom we had given priority. On June 1, 1950, the committee called Rev. J. Leon Hooper as executive in charge of the New York office and asked Mr. Henderson to take over our office in Munich, Germany, and to make the remaining selections and to expedite the processing of our DP's for emigration. The Security Act of September 1950 broke a bottleneck in the processing of DP's that was holding up several thousand cases, among them 700 of ours. In the great flood of paper work which ensued in the operation overseas, it was only necessary to see that our Presbyterian cases got their fair share of attention. The flow of our DP's into the United States increased steadily during the fall of 1950, and it became necessary to increase the New York office staff. Dr. A. G. Fletcher was called in at this time to help with the resettlement phase of the work, and he took responsibility for all professionals and single men. On the Pacific coast the coming of the Shanghai DP's from Samar, Philippines Islands, and other resettlement problems made necessary again a representative there, and Rev. Paul Melrose was appointed and served for the calendar year of 1951. Overseas a second bottleneck in processing developed because of doubts



as to interpretation of the Security Act. These were finally resolved by an amendment passed in March 1951. During the months preceding the passing by Congress of this amendment our church made a notable contribution by lending to the World Council of Churches the legal counselor of the foreign board, Mr. Howard B. Vail, who spent 3 months in Germany gathering data and several weeks of intense work after his return presenting the data to the proper authorities. The coordinated efforts of Mr. Vail and the legal advisers of other agencies had a great deal to do with the passage of the amendment of the Security Act. On March 1, when the work overseas was well in hand, Dr. Hooper returned to his work in the foreign board and Mr. Henderson was called back to New York. During the 6 months (November 1951-April 1952) the arrival rate of our DP's has been greater than at any period in the program.

#### Resettlement statistics

##### Arrivals to date:

DP's (from Germany, Austria)-----	2,163
Volksdeutsche (ethnic German)-----	220
Out-of-zone DP's-----	67
<b>Total cases-----</b>	<b>2,450</b>
<b>Total individuals (adults, 4,046; children, 1,663)-----</b>	<b>5,709</b>

##### Religious breakdown:

Reformed-----	878
Orthodox-----	1,025
Other (mostly Lutheran)-----	547

**Total----- 2,450**

Arizona-----	2	New England-----	62
Arkansas-----	2	New Jersey-----	269
Baltimore-----	26	New Mexico-----	5
California-----	153	New York-----	561
Colorado-----	31	North Dakota-----	2
Florida-----	1	Ohio-----	252
Idaho-----	9	Oklahoma-----	34
Illinois-----	120	Oregon-----	24
Indiana-----	55	Pennsylvania-----	309
Iowa-----	61	South Dakota-----	12
Kansas-----	32	Texas-----	59
Kentucky-----	14	Utah-----	3
Michigan-----	91	Washington-----	45
Mid-South-----	12	West Virginia-----	51
Minnesota-----	29	Wisconsin-----	52
Missouri-----	26	Wyoming-----	8
Montana-----	18		
Nebraska-----	20	<b>Total-----</b>	<b>2,450</b>

#### HARD-CORE CASES

War, flight, life in refugee camps over a period of 5 years or more, all combined to produce their toll of tragic cases. We dared not harden our hearts toward the widows, the maimed, the aged. While taking every possible precaution and making most careful arrangements in resettling these, we have brought, as our share of the so-called hard-core cases, the following:

- 22 widows with their 42 children
- 81 maimed and listed as 40 percent or more disabled
- 76 aged (65 or over)

#### FINANCIAL REPORT

Receipts 1949-52 from One Great Hour of Sharing-----	\$225,000.00
Expenditures during the 3 years-----	184,912.60
<b>Balance on hand-----</b>	<b>40,087.40</b>
<b>Cost per DP \$32.40.</b>	

## APPRECIATION

If credit for what has been accomplished by this committee is to be given, the one man worthy of receiving it is the Reverend Charles T. Leber whose mind and spirit has been the guiding factor and propelling power in the work of the committee. It is impossible, however, to overemphasize the fact that this program has been successful only because of the fine response the churches the country over have made. The program has never lagged because of the lack of assurances. The committee has never been embarrassed because of the lack of a sponsor for a DP and his family. Our church was a bit slow in getting started, but the earnest response by Presbyterians everywhere has made our DP program outstanding. We can now report that we have resettled more DP's than any other denomination (except Lutherans who carried through an exceedingly large program for their own people). No DP of the Reformed Church remained in Europe for the lack of an assurance. We were able to give a standing invitation through the Hungarian newspapers and magazines of Germany and Austria to all Protestant Hungarians. We also gave consideration to all the professionally trained and better educated folks at a time when most agencies were giving preference to farmers and strong-backed laborers. In doing this we in turn received much. Three scholarly ministers have been installed in Presbyterian pastorates. Others are still in training. Sixty-three doctors whom we have sponsored are now working as resident doctors and interns, looking forward to the not-to-distant day when they will take State examinations for license. The amount that this group spent in Europe on their professional preparation alone would total in dollars and cents far more than the entire cost of our program. Aside from these, there are men of fine training and experience from every walk of life that have been included in the great host of newcomers. It still remains true (as reported last year) that over 90 percent of our DP's have made most satisfactory resettlements and are already making fine contributions to the life of their several communities, not only economically but culturally and spiritually. Of the remaining 10 percent, all but a very few will become adjusted through the continued special attention they are receiving.

## ON-GOING PROGRAM

Under the present DP law there still are some people coming to us. There will probably be a dozen families or so each month up through spring of 1954. Also additional legislation now pending may open the way to cleaning up the DP situation in Europe and so bring us an allotment of several hundred more before the end of 1952. Beyond this, our church can never again be unaware of immigrants in our communities. Nor can we again be unmindful of the stateless, homeless, hopeless refugees—80 million of them at present throughout the world. Because of this prospect for the future this committee has been regularized as a committee of the General Council and its name has been changed to Committee on Resettlement Services of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and it has been instructed by the general council to "enlarge its functions to include services to refugees." The committee has appointed Miss Margaret Gillespie as associate executive secretary and has adopted a program that is essentially expressed in the following three recommendations:

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That special encouragement and leadership be given to local pastors and congregations in taking responsibility for the social and spiritual welfare of resettled families, and that, in order to further understanding of the psychological and sociological factors in homelessness, migration, and resettlement, the fullest possible use be made of discussion groups, platform programs, visual aides, church press, and other media.
2. That promotion of the resettlement services program be continued with a view to procuring such additional assurances as may be needed.
3. That the need of maintaining, after 1952, the program of resettlement service (selection, reception, and placement) be recognized and that the committee on resettlement services be instructed to plan for such needs as they become evident.

Commissioner PICKETT. Have you given any thought to the question as to what basis immigrants coming to this country ought to be selected on, if you don't take the present basis?

Dr. TURNER. Yes, sir; I think it ought to be without discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. Discrimination based on what?

Dr. TURNER. Well, discrimination based on race, color, or religion. I think as a democracy we cannot put ourselves in the position of ever discriminating; that is, if we are true to the heritage of our fathers.

The CHAIRMAN. If you eliminate the present quota system, what are you going to substitute in its place?

Dr. TURNER. That, I cannot answer.

The CHAIRMAN. You see, when people testify before us to the effect that they do not favor the present quota system we are interested in learning what they would propose in its place.

Dr. TURNER. I see the problem. I referred to the fact that I had made a hasty perusal of the matter, and I do not speak as one who has expert knowledge on the situation. I am purely reflecting from the standpoint of our background and traditions as a democracy. There ought to be some way that we would not show discrimination, for the sake of good will and our effectiveness for building a world of peace and understanding for all mankind to live together as the children of God.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for appearing.

Dr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave a letter here of the International Club of Young Women's Christian Association, over the signature of Mrs. George T. Douglas, chairman, and it was addressed to Rev. Robert B. Griffin, who is executive director of the Christian Council of Atlanta. He is out of the city, and his secretary sent it to me, and also a letter from a Mrs. H. H. Chin Liu, out here at Emory University, that I would like to leave with the reporter and see that it is inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you may leave those letters with the reporter, and they will be inserted in the record.

(The letters follow:)

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,

72 Edgewood Avenue NW., Atlanta, Ga., October 10, 1952.

REV. ROBERT B. GRIFFIN,

Christian Council of Atlanta,

167 Walton Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR REVEREND GRIFFIN: Our international group here at the YWCA took real pride in being asked by you to make a contribution toward emphasizing the much-needed revision of the McCarran bill. I brought up the problem and found a tremendous interest, but it was very difficult to get a really united idea for emphasis to represent group thinking. Some of the Americans in the group felt the club was too young to enter into a controversial situation as a club and a few of the foreign visitors had a real feeling of fear to express a personal opinion.

We seemed to be unanimous, however, in wishing there were some way we could express the hope that similarities of people and agreements on principles and ideals be stressed rather than differences and disagreements—in this way lead to a less rigid quota system based on appreciation of people as individuals.

Members of the new American group and those foreigners visiting felt that each individual here in the United States would have a different reason and feeling for wishing to lessen restrictions on immigration and naturalization. There was a natural show of intense feeling from many of "us." Problems suggested by individuals to whom I talked privately had to do with deep resentment as to the discrimination on the color question, for example, the small quotas from Asia as compared with British quotas. There were questions around the devastating effects where families have been separated sometimes seemingly without reason. Others were disappointed over ideals being shattered, of the United States as a democratic country, and the McCarran bill seemed to intensify this disappointment.

The following club members were suggested as people who would be glad to talk to you or Dr. Turner individually. Dr. Hugo Skala, 1515 Markan Drive NE. (Atwood 0512), professor of Atlanta University; Mr. Herman Yang, Exchange 6860, 2817 Beacon Boulevard (you remember he was on your WAGA program), and our president, Mr. Wapensky (Evergreen 1609), suggested that a Miss Chew, a student at Emory whose name and address are not on our list, would be able to give good suggestions as to emphasis.

We do appreciate your giving us the excellent TV program and the added interest of giving us at least an opportunity to try to mold public opinion on a matter so vital to our group.

Cordially,

Mrs. GEORGE T. DOUGLAS,  
Chairman, International Club.

---

EMORY UNIVERSITY, GEORGIA, *October 14, 1952.*

DR. ROBERT GRIFFIN,  
167 Walton Street, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR DR. GRIFFIN: It is very thoughtful of you to give me the opportunity to express my feelings toward the present immigration law, especially concerning Chinese people. Personally speaking, I have been very fortunate in many ways and people treat me nicely wherever I go. Therefore, I have no complaint to make whatsoever concerning myself.

Since I don't know the detail content of the present immigration law, therefore, for the ultimate well-intention toward the United States as well as all people over the world, we should check it in the light of the following points:

1. Justice: Is the restriction of number fair in the present immigration law? How is the quota system? What is its basis? Is the ratio according to population of each nation?

2. Political point of view: If every nation treats aliens in the reciprocal way, how would the immigration law of this country work? Would it drive those people who have no political affiliation to the enemies who do not have so much red tapes to immigrants? In the long run, would the present immigration law really prevent Communists to come in and grant United States good will, prosperity, and leadership in the world? I sincerely hope that the United States will not follow the steps of imperialism, but stands firmly for true democracy.

However, it is very wise of United States Government, that the present immigration law is in abeyance toward Chinese people, so she holds lots of most well-trained and intelligent Chinese scholars from the Communist regime. On the other hand, as a Christian, I am real sorry for those Chinese people who have no "isms" whatsoever, but they have to lose the service and effort of their sons and daughters, maybe forever, and with the whip of communism in return.

It would be more than a pleasure, if I could be of any service to you. Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. H. H. CHIU LIU.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Rev. Robert Ayers here?

# STATEMENT OF REV. ROBERT H. AYERS, CHAPLAIN AND HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Reverend AYERS. I am Rev. Robert H. Ayers, chaplain and head of the department of religion at the University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

I have a prepared statement, which has been subscribed to by Rabbi Joseph Rudavsky; Rev. Omar R. Fink, Jr.; Rev. Brunson Wallace; Rev. Dow Kirkpatrick; Father Walter J. Donovan; and Rev. J. Earl Gilbreath, all of Athens. I would like to read the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear it.

(The statement read by Rev. Robert H. Ayers follows:)

A STATEMENT ON IMMIGRATION POLICY FOR THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON  
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

I am speaking on behalf of a group of seven ministers in Athens, Ga.—five Protestants, one Catholic, and one Jewish. We wish to testify together as American citizens, as southerners, and as ministers. This country has been built by immigrants. It has a tradition of being open to those who seek refuge here, and we see no reason why this should change.

As southerners and as citizens of the State of Georgia, we realize that in this region immigration is no social and economic problem at all. The State of Georgia is not in the direct stream of immigration, and has in the past received but a very small proportion of the people that came to the United States. In 1940 the percent foreign born in Georgia was only 0.39 as compared to a national average of 8.6. The displaced-person program brought just under 400,000 people to this country. Of these only 1,200 came to Georgia. Although Georgia has about 2.3 percent of the Nation's population, it received only three-tenths of 1 percent of the displaced persons. Of these 1,200, some 700 moved on to the other States, and only about 500 remained in the State of Georgia. If this situation is typical, then under an assumed actual immigration of, say, 200,000 a year, only about 200 a year would settle in Georgia. It would be absurd to claim that any social or economic problem can arise from the arrival of so small a group.

The current University of Georgia study of the DP's in Georgia shows that these DP's that ultimately settled here have already made an excellent adjustment. Most of them are craftsmen, skilled and semiskilled workers, small-business men, and professionals. Their children are hardly distinguishable from American children, even though they have been here only a few years. Experiences with foreign students at the University of Georgia point to the same conclusion. By the time these students finish, and are ready to return to their home land, they have, as a rule, become thoroughly adjusted to the American way of life.

The study also shows that no frictions whatever developed between newcomers and native-born Georgians on account of nationality, language, or religion. Georgians traditionally accept people on their own merits, and this has been the case with these recent immigrants, too. Such difficulties as arose stemmed from the worker-employer relationship, and concerned working conditions and workers' performance only.

The absorption of newcomers in this State is greatly aided by the fact that they seem to disperse well, and do not form national and language groups within the State. The economic adjustment of the DP's has also been remarkable. Those who stayed have become self-supporting in a short time, and many of them have stated that the opportunities they found in Georgia exceeded anything that Europe had to offer them. What actually happened is that they came to a rapidly changing and progressing State that can right now use all the skills and personal capabilities it can obtain. In the past, much of the native southern talent has been drained off to other regions. As citizens of Georgia, we are convinced that this State is headed for great things, and that our ability to grasp the opportunities before us will in part depend on our ability to keep our best people here, and to make others come and settle here, Americans and immigrants alike.

In fact, we wonder whether our problem in Georgia is not one of too little, rather than too much, immigration. Immigration is desirable. In the past, the waves of immigration have always been followed by a rise in the standard of living, and by greater national productivity. In this State, progress has depended on mobility between the regions of the State and mobility within the Nation. Let us not forget that the history of the State of Georgia begins with General Oglethorpe arriving with shiploads of immigrants, many of them DP's from Salzburg, Austria.

At present, the tremendous increase of industry in the State tends to pull independent craftsmen out of the communities where they have small businesses of their own. They are attracted by the high wages offered by industry. Skilled craftsmen from Europe can and should replace them.

These immigrants like to be independent, and will build up small businesses, thus becoming a valuable addition to smaller communities where there is a need in the field of services.

From a national point of view, the outstanding fact to be considered, in our opinion, is that this country, with its allies, is facing an increasingly hostile block that includes some of the largest and fastest growing countries in the world. Our population of 150 million is growing much more slowly than the 200 millions in Russia, the over 400 millions in China, and many more millions in eastern Europe who are now under Russian domination. The day will surely come when we will need every man and woman who has been brought over and has been integrated with our own population. Our astounding economic, technological, and social advances should not make us forget that the root of everything is in the people.

Moreover, Russia's advances in Europe have profoundly changed our own immigration picture. No longer can the masses of Eastern Europeans who have in the past sought to come to this country leave their homeland. The iron curtain has come down, one of the greatest sources of immigrants has been cut off. This leaves us with immigration of Western Europeans, people closest to us in origin, culture, and way of life, an immigration that will culturally enrich us in the future as it has enriched us in the past. In the future we are going to get the best-trained, the best-qualified, the most easily absorbed immigrants we have had in a long time. To erect new barriers to immigration at this point does not make sense. Stalin started the process of restricting postwar immigration by cutting off all of Eastern Europe. The McCarran Act completes this process by letting down another iron curtain at our own border.

Over and above all these considerations, important as they are, we must, however, stress the fact that immigration is a human and religious problem. There is a divine imperative to give succor to the dispossessed. According to the report of the National DP Commission in the spring of 1952, there were still 340,000 refugees living in mass camps in Germany. There are 18,000 to 20,000 German refugees fleeing into Western Germany every month. The problem of overpopulation, aggravated by large concentrations of refugees, exists in Western Germany, Greece, Italy, Trieste, and in the Netherlands.

The Bible tells us that we should love our neighbors, and, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, it defines neighbor as anyone in trouble and need. These thousands of suffering and homeless people are our neighbors when we should help to build new lives and to find new homes. To ignore them, to refuse them the opportunities afforded by this great land of ours is to violate the will of God who created them as well as us.

May I quote to you a statement by an American theologian of a generation ago, Walter Rauschenbusch. It is to be found in the June 4 issue of the periodical, *The Christian Century*. It concerns what happened to Pilate's washbowl.

"On the eve of the day of the Crucifixion, the washbowl disappeared from the palace. Nobody knows who took it. Some accused Judas Iscariot of selling it; but this is plainly a libel, because Judas was honest enough to go and hang himself. At any rate, ever since that time the washbowl is abroad in the land, carried by infernal hands wherever it is needed, and men are constantly joining the invisible choir which performs its imperceptible ablutions therein. The statesman who suppresses principles because they might endanger the success of his party; the good citizen who will have nothing to do with politics; the editor who sees a righteous cause misrepresented and says nothing because it might injure circulation; the deacon who sees a clique undermining a pastor's position and dares not create a disturbance; the preacher who sees Dives exploiting Lazarus and dares not tell him to quit, because Dives contributes to his salary; all those are using Pilate's washbowl. Listen: Do you hear the splash of water near to you? The Devil is pouring it."

We do not have to strain our ears today to hear the dripping water of people washing their hands in Pilate's bowl. Those who say let the Europeans solve their own problem, let them take care of the DP's, are washing in it. The McCarran act is America's way of using Pilate's washbowl. We must not let it stand, but must assume our responsibility to love our neighbors as ourselves.

MR. ROSENFELD. Reverend Ayers, your statement seems to indicate that right now Georgia can use all the skills and personal capabilities it can obtain. Would you care to enlighten the Commission as to that situation a little further? Is there a shortage of people in the State of Georgia to perform the necessary labor in the State?

Reverend AYERS. I can speak from my own personal experience; for example, if you have tried to get a broken-down furnace fixed, that needs repair, and have waited several weeks to secure someone to fix it, and the same thing with plumbing and other household appliances that go wrong and you need some help for it and you must wait for weeks to get a craftsman to come in and do the job, the natural assumption is that there is a shortage.

The large plants that have come in, the plant at Marietta, these industries have drained off from our medium-sized communities and our small communities persons who would normally stay there and conduct their own businesses.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Then would you say that the people of Georgia are finding it difficult to obtain, from what you say, essential workers for their industrial and agricultural activities?

Reverend AYERS. That is my impression.

Commissioner PICKETT. I notice in your prepared statement that you refer to a study that was made by the University of Georgia. I wonder if it gives any statistical data on that question, shortage of labor or surplus of labor, whichever it may be, and what can be done about that?

Reverend AYERS. Dr. Sebba is here, and he conducted that study. Could you answer that question?

Dr. SEBBA. Yes.

#### STATEMENT OF GREGUR SEBBA, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Dr. SEBBA. I am Dr. Gregur Sebba, a professor at the University of Georgia. We are conducting the study for the Displaced Persons Commission in the State. It is authorized by the Governor, and our only purpose is to find out how the displaced persons' problem has been handled in the State and how the displaced persons have adjusted themselves to it.

In the course of our study we have of course taken cognizance of the fact that there are shortages in—there is not a general shortage of labor in Georgia, but there are shortages in specific fields. One of the most important ones is of course the need for farm labor, which by the way has not been filled by the displaced persons, and another one which is quite evident is the shortage of people in these small businesses that are independent businesses, and a great many DP's have moved into that kind of business, but we do not have the statistics. They would have to come from the State Department of Labor.

Mr. ROSENFELD. In these small businesses, could you identify some of them for the Commission, where are the shortages that you feel need to be filled?

Dr. SEBBA. Well, I can only say perhaps by the businesses the DP's have started. There are such things as watch repair, especially where there are shortages; people who make watches are in industry. They shift rapidly. Our experience has never been that there is a watchmaker there longer than about 2 years. There is a DP who has been there 2½ years, on 11 acres of land and a two-room house; there is no intention to leave, he feels at home and intends to stay. There are people who have become locksmiths, cabinetmakers and so on. In the urban areas, some of these people are also being drawn into industry;

but in the small communities they typically stay where they are and form their own businesses and become a member of the community.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Is that study completed?

Dr. SEBBA. No, sir; it will be completed this December and will be submitted to the Governor.

Mr. ROSENFELD. If it is a public report, would you be good enough to supply copies of that report to the Commission?

Dr. SEBBA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Miss Calhoun here?

### STATEMENT OF EMILY CALHOUN, RECORDING CLERK OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, ATLANTA

Miss CALHOUN. I am Emily Calhoun, recording clerk of the Religious Society of Friends, 1798 Monroe Drive NE., Atlanta.

The Society of Friends has not taken any official stand on this McCarran Act, but I would like to ask that we be permitted to file a statement at a later date, just as soon as we can have a meeting and take a stand on it. That was all.

The CHAIRMAN. That permission will be granted. Could you give us some idea as to when the statement could be filed?

Miss CALHOUN. We will meet Sunday night and should be able to get the statement drawn up within the next week.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. You will send it to Washington?

Miss CALHOUN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

(The submitted statement follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF ATLANTA MONTHLY MEETING, RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

This memorandum is prepared by a committee appointed by the Atlanta monthly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends to express the feelings of the meeting regarding the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States.

The Religious Society of Friends has, from its very beginning, placed major emphasis upon the interdependence of individuals and peoples, their equality in the sight of God, the responsibility of the strong toward the weak. The recent McCarran Act passed by Congress cuts directly across much that we hold sacred. We condemn it on ethical grounds and as a matter of mere expediency. We feel that this law will have a most detrimental effect on world-wide opinion of our country's policies. The law seems to have been designed to keep immigration at a minimum and to perpetuate to a large extent a racial discrimination which is at direct variance with our basic democratic belief that all men are created equal.

We shall discuss the act under four main headings:

##### *1. Racial discrimination*

The vast majority of the world's people are those whom we call colored. For the most part we enjoy their good will today. But our strength tomorrow depends on our behavior today, and good will is much harder to reclaim than it is to retain. Let us therefore eliminate discrimination against these peoples from our immigration policies.

To this end, we feel that 1950 census figures, including those for American Negroes, should be used in calculating quotas and that quotas should be set impartially, on the same basis for all nationalities and races.

Furthermore, the provision of the McCarran act whereby nationals of any country, if they can trace as much as half of their ancestry back to the Asia-Pacific area, can be admitted only under the quotas of that area should be removed from the law. The same should be done with the provision setting



individual limits for each of the British colonies in the Caribbean area, and for all other such devices for perpetuating race discrimination.

## 2. *Standards for admission and deportation*

Firstly, we do not believe the President should have unlimited power to reduce or stop immigration at his discretion at any time.

Secondly, we find the subjectivity of standards, the too great dependence on the opinion of individual immigration officials highly undesirable. The grounds for exclusion and deportation should be based to as great an extent as possible on factual evidence.

In the matter of selecting individuals for admission to this country we feel that, given reasonable health of mind and body, the character of the applicant is the most important consideration. We therefore very strongly urge that selection be done by men and women highly trained and discerning, and not left to consuls who are usually not equipped for this task. So important is this task of selection that money should be appropriated so that the work can be wisely done before embarkation.

Finally, we believe that to assure a more standard policy a board or boards of appeals should be set up which would have final authority in cases of admission and deportation where there is now no appeal beyond the consular level.

## 3. *Quotas*

The millions of displaced persons have put a temporary strain on the kindness of free nations. We have been carrying no more than our share of the burden, and this is no time to restrict our generous-mindedness. A cancellation of the mortgages raised against future quotas to admit these persons and the admission of a few thousands more, over and above our annual quotas, would not strain our ability to absorb and would do much for our self-respect.

We recognize the desire to control the amount of competition offered by immigrant workers to our own citizens but believe that many more skilled and semiskilled immigrants could profitably be employed in this country, particularly in the South. Testimony at the public hearing in Atlanta October 17 pointed out the successful integration of recent immigrants to this area and the need for more such immigrants as the South becomes more industrialized.

## 4. *Deportation*

The retroactive nature of the laws governing deportation seems to us to be in the nature of an *ex post facto* law, and therefore a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of our Constitution.

Deportation itself is of doubtful worth. For the noncitizen offender, if the offense warrants, it may be justified, but to deport one who has long resided among us and has become a citizen cannot be defended on any grounds. It is simply the admission of our inability to control through our own laws. There should be no different classes of citizenship. All citizens, regardless of origin, should be subject to the same law, and if our laws and courts are unequal to the ends of justice, it is they that should be strengthened and not the citizen deported.

In conclusion, we urge that a permanent congressional committee be established to make periodic study of our immigration and naturalization policies and the administration of them.

Respectfully submitted,

EMILY CALHOUN, *Chairman*,  
JOHN W. STANLEY,  
FRANCES BROWN.

Is Father McDonough here?

## STATEMENT OF REV. JOHN J. McDONOUGH, ASSISTANT PASTOR OF THE CATHEDRAL OF CHRIST THE KING

Reverend McDONOUGH. I am the Reverend John J. McDonough, assistant pastor of the Cathedral of Christ the King, 2699 Peach Tree Road N.E., Atlanta, Ga.

I am here simply as the son of immigrant parents, since I am a first generation American born.

I am not speaking as a representative of the Catholic Church. I don't know if the church has made any official pronouncements on the McCarran-Walter Nationality Act.

However, as a citizen of the United States of America, and as I am affected by all the laws and enactments of our Congress, I feel that I have some interest in this particular bill. I am here this morning because I feel very sincerely and very deeply that the United States of America is at the crossroads of its permanent niche in history.

As you all know, as well as I do, America is not a very old country, quite the opposite is true. You all know as well as I do that America is not a Nation of one pure racial strain. Just the very opposite is true. We are a Nation of many races, of many peoples, of great diversities. It is my honest opinion that the people of the United States of America are a great and a strong Nation because we have presented to the world at large an ideal of dignity, an ideal of freedom and liberty. I feel that here in the United States of America the dignity of men has been able to bloom and flower better than any other place in the entire world. It is my opinion that we have a great Nation because we have accepted the culture of the past. Having accepted the culture of the past we have become the tremendous Nation that we are at the present time.

However, I feel that there is some doubt within my mind, some honest doubt, as to our position in the future. I feel this doubt about our security and about our security in the future precisely because of this Immigration and Nationality Act. It seems to me that it presents to us a rather narrow and selfish and impractical point of view. It seems that we have deviated from the lofty ideals that the Declaration of Independence has given to us. There are in this Act several features that seem to me to be contrary to the ideals of the United States of America and the people of the United States of America.

We have, as you all know, the Statue of Liberty which fronts the grand harbor of New York. Part of the inscription on that is: "Give to me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free." That Statue of Liberty is a symbol for all peoples throughout the entire world who have been pressed by the slavery of totalitarianism. Therefore, it seems to me to be a sort of mockery when we are proclaiming that we are above all things par excellence, a Nation that loves freedom, a Nation that will do anything to keep people free. A Nation that will do anything to help people find its freedom when in this particular act we more or less give the lie to the feelings we have.

There are several features in this particular bill which seem to me I cannot agree with. The first is the limitation on the number of immigrants that we are going to take into our country. Needless to say that we cannot accept completely and entirely without any limitation the number of people who might want to come into our land, but I do feel that since statistics seem to prove that we have not been using our quotas in the past and that there seems to be a need for more people living and working in our country, if we are going to fulfill our destiny we need new life and new blood in our country.

Communism I don't think would be too much of a threat to us if it were limited to Russia; but communism is not limited to Russia. It has received new blood and new ideas and new inspiration from the various peoples throughout the entire world. It has gone out and has reached these people. I think that we in our country need

to take in people of the other world, the other races and nations, so that they can continue to give us the strength and the inspiration that they have given us in the past. I also feel that it is more or less of an insult to the American people who believe in freedom to, shall we say, more or less make a category as to the type of races that we can take into our country. This bill, I think, limits the type of persons that are acceptable to us. We will accept certain people because they seem to be more inclined to our way of thinking, because they seem to be a superior type of person, because they are completely wrong and completely a denial of any law of God. We know, of course, that all men are created by Almighty God equal; we know that all men practically are not equal but all men can be made equal if they are given the opportunity to express themselves and to develop themselves. Certainly the discrimination of the national origins is something that is offensive to me as an individual.

Likewise, I would say that the tone of the entire McCarran bill seems to indicate that America, the United States of America, is a superior moral person, that we have more or less drawn ourselves up to our full height and we are the ones who are determining whether or not other peoples of other nations are equal to us.

At the present time, we might say that we are the moral leaders of the world; but the freedom bug has sprung and has disseminated into practically every part of the northern world at the present time. Today, nations that never before were thinking of freedom and human dignity are thinking of it. They are looking to us, the people of the United States of America, to give them an example of what we mean by freedom, to show them that when we talk about freedom we are not only talking about freedom but rather that we are believing it.

I think it is common knowledge that during the past 2 or 3 years there has been a good bit of difficulty in attaining the quota that is necessary for the draft. We know that we are faced with the imminent fight with communism; whether that devolves into an all-out war is not known. We pray and hope that it will not be, but we do know that in our country we do have a large number of young men who are not capable of taking up arms in defense of ourselves. If our Nation is going to remain strong, if our Nation is going to be able to present to the forces of Russia a strong and vital force that will eventually win them into the fold of Christianity, we must present to them a Nation that is strong and can defeat them.

Therefore, it is my personal opinion that this McCarran-Walter Act is offensive to me as a citizen of the United States of America. It is my hope that in the new Congress this bill will be amended so we will take in more of the people of Europe from whom we have drawn so much in the past, and also Asia and from whom we can gain so much in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of your criticism of the act, what would you substitute in place of the present quota system?

Reverend McDONOUGH. You mean, to what extent are we going to raise the quota?

The CHAIRMAN. I am assuming for the purpose of the question that the over-all limitation remains the same; under what method would you assign the quotas if you are opposed to the present system?

Reverend McDONOUGH. I think it would depend to a large extent upon the need that we have from the individual nations. However, I do think that it would be wrong, shall we say, to take 10,000 people from Ireland and to limit it to, shall we say, 1,000 people from Indochina. There are certain problems that would arise, I should imagine, in the amalgamation of those people into our own country; it would be much easier for the Irish to be amalgamated into the United States of America at the present time than it would be for people coming from Indochina, because of the few people that we have that are from there at the present time.

Therefore, it would certainly not be feasible to take in 10,000 people from Indochina when they were going to create a rather serious problem in our own country. In other words, it would depend upon how we would be able to handle the people that were coming in. Such a thing would have to be determined, of course, according to the circumstances of the type of person who is coming into our country and the means that we have for taking care of them.

However, the fact that we have no means at the present time to take care of, shall we say, any of the Asiatics that might be coming into our country, should not at the same time lead us to write a bill that would be discriminatory against them. It is up to us to make sure that there are certain means available to them when they come in so they will not be the object of fear and oppression.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, I am assuming all the time that the Congress and none of us want to take in anybody or admit anybody unless it is decided in advance that those admissions are for the best interests of the United States.

Reverend McDONOUGH. That is right. Not only that, but also for the best interests of the world at large.

If the unused quotas could be used, then I can see no reason why you just simply can't reassign different quotas from the other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. But how are you going to reassign them? How are you going to distribute the unused quotas?

Reverend McDONOUGH. Well, I cannot say what the problem would be.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, all right. Thank you, sir.

Reverend AYERS. I would like to suggest the Humphrey-Lehman bill. It seems to me to have a fairly good answer, to pool unused quotas on a preferential basis to relatives of United States residents and to immigrants whose services are greatly needed, or to persons who are persecuted because of race, religion, or what not.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we know what is in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, of course, and we are trying to find out what the people's views are around the country.

Reverend AYERS. That is my answer to it. Also using the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Father Donovan here?

**STATEMENT OF REV. WALTER J. DONOVAN, DIRECTOR OF  
RESETTLEMENT, CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF SAVANNAH-ATLANTA**

Reverend DONOVAN. I am Rev. Walter J. Donovan, director of resettlement, Diocese of Savannah-Atlanta, 134 Price Avenue, Athens, Ga. I have a prepared statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear it.

Reverend DONOVAN. For the past 4 years I have served as the director of resettlement of displaced persons in the Diocese of Savannah-Atlanta. From this experience I have reached the following conclusions concerning immigration to the United States.

1. Immigration is necessary for the continued economic development of our country and particularly for the development of this region. It is my conviction that one of the greatest obstacles to progress in our section of the country is the shortage of manpower which prevents the full use of the resources with which God has blessed us.

2. We must take the immigrants that are available. The McCarran-Walter Act is rigged to provide for the entrance of immigrants from northern and western Europe at the expense of prospective immigrants from eastern and southern Europe. This policy is, of course, unfair, un-American, and un-Christian. It is also unrealistic. The immigration experience of the past two decades establishes the fact that the northern and western European countries are no longer able to send immigrants to our country in large enough numbers to meet our needs. Therefore, we should make provision to see that a welcome is given to immigrants from those countries which have a surplus population.

3. In the course of directing the Catholic DP program in Georgia, I helped to resettle immigrants in Georgia from Ukrania, Lithuania, Poland, Germany, Hungary, and Italy. Without exception, I found them adaptable to life in America. The men were talented and industrious—the women were home-loving and frugal—the children were intelligent and zealous students. All of them are now, and were in a matter of days after their arrival, real assets to our country. To impede the flow of such people into this land of plenty would be a shameful act of selfishness which would eventually result in stultifying our own progress.

4. I realize that there are millions of people in Europe who need a haven where they can enjoy the freedom to provide for themselves. And I think that we need these people. To be able to live here would be a boon for them, but we must also remember that having them here would also be a blessing for us.

It is my earnest hope, therefore, that the immigration policy of our Government will be altered so that as many people as possible will be able to enjoy the freedom and prosperity that is ours in the United States.

Commissioner PICKETT. Which would you think was more important if you had to choose between them, a revision of the present legislation or special legislation as was provided in the Displaced Persons Act?

Reverend DONOVAN. I think that both are necessary. First of all, a revision of the legislation because I think that the countries from which we have been getting our immigration in the past are no longer in a position to supply it; and therefore we might as well recognize the facts as they are and begin to take people from those regions of the world that can supply the people.

I know that right at this particular moment there is exceptional this manpower and they are a group of people in whom naturally we could have special legislation to help relieve that particular international problem.

I think too, in cooperation with many of the other governments of the world, particularly in our own hemisphere, that we could work out a cooperative effort to resettle the crowded peoples of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. In your statement you are assuming that, or you believe that, because of your own experience that there is room for additional numbers of immigrants here, and that the country needs them. The question has been asked as to whether in coming to conclusions of that kind you take into account the fact that we have a number of boys in the military services, the Army, Navy, the Marines, and other branches of the armed services, if you take into account the fact that before long we hope they will be home again and they will need places too?

Reverend DONOVAN. But I think that there is plenty of places for everybody, as a matter of fact, and while I too would hope the boys would be home next week, realistically, even though the boys who are now overseas might be home, I don't think anybody can doubt the fact that for some time to come we are going to have a good many boys in the armed services. I hope that we won't have to have them in foreign countries, but at least we are going to have to maintain our own military strength and we are going to have to maintain enough military strength.

The CHAIRMAN. But are you allowing for the fact that we do have this manpower and they are a group of people in whom naturally we would be more interested first, before any other people that are not citizens of this country?

Reverend DONOVAN. But I think the addition of immigrant people in this country would assist those boys who are to come back, because immigrants provide not only producers but consumers too; and at least most of the immigrants I have seen had more producers than consumers. They have had fathers, mothers, and three, four, or five children. While the father is adding to the production system in the country, the mother and the children are adding to the consuming part. So I think they could help to provide an expansion of our economy that would make things better for the boys who return from the service.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Mrs. Sterne here?

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. I. F. STERNE, PRESIDENT, ATLANTA FEDERATION FOR JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE

Mrs. STERNE. I am Mrs. I. F. Sterne, president of the Atlanta Federation for Jewish Social Service, 1086 Briarcliff Road, Atlanta.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read in behalf of our organization.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be pleased to hear it.

Mrs. STERNE. The whole problem of immigration, helping newcomers to become good American citizens is not new to the Federation for Jewish Social Service. As early as 1890, the work of the Montefiore Relief Association, in cooperation with the then Federation of Jewish Charities, dealt with immigrants and their problems of adjustment.

The majority of those immigrants came from Eastern European countries. They have all been integrated into the civic and cultural life of our community. Numbered among them are outstanding civic leaders in service clubs, community chest, philanthropies, and business.

They have established businesses, both large and small, giving employment to countless numbers of native Americans.

In more recent years there was the immigration of refugees who came in during 1938-41. These people came with social and cultural backgrounds of Western Europe—mainly Germany and Austria. They arrived stripped of most of their earthly possessions—but with the urge to start a new life.

They, too, made excellent adjustments. Their first aim was to become American citizens—and they spread into all types of occupations—among them were scientists, a doctor, and businessmen.

They became substantial citizens, they own their homes, and see that their children are well educated.

They are vitally interested in the democratic processes. All have become citizens and exercise their privilege of the franchise at the polls.

To cite one instance, Mrs. A received training as a registered nurse and at great personal sacrifice worked at the hospital all through the war years because she felt it was her obligation to continue to serve due to the great shortage of nurses.

All of their boys served in the armed services and went overseas. Many of them were extremely valuable, because of their knowledge of languages and made outstanding contributions toward the war effort in the intelligence department—and many remained for several years in the Army of Occupation in West Germany.

Along about the same time that this group came to Atlanta, a group of young men were brought to Georgia—to study farming and agricultural pursuits. These were brought in cooperation with the National Youth Administration and were placed in various schools—many in the University of Georgia Agricultural College. A number of them have made agriculture their life work and from our latest reports some are operating modern farms in New Jersey and Connecticut. All were in the armed services.

A great many of these new Americans were regular contributors to the Red Cross blood bank, etc. They deemed it a privilege. Practically all have remained in Atlanta, and are a real part of the community and are helping magnificently in the work with the latest newcomers.

The most recent immigration, the displaced persons who have come since 1945, is the most unusual—unusual because of the remarkable adjustment they have made despite the terrific handicaps. When we stop to consider their terrifying experiences, their lives in concentration camps, seeing their entire families exterminated before their eyes, children torn from their mothers' arms, unspeakable hor-

rors, it is only their toughness that enabled them to survive. Yet, they carry within them the effect of these experiences. These people, too, are learning fast and are becoming part of our community.

Two hundred and eighty-eight of them have come into this community. They have received the assistance and guidance of the local federation, which is the voluntary social-service agency working with them. Volunteers from the local section of the Council of Jewish Women have, in close cooperation with the staff of the Federation for Jewish Social Service, assisted in the organization of English classes, home economics, and in shopping tours, teaching the DP's our American ways of life.

There has been some retraining along related lines in the field of the man's original work. Mr. B, who was a barber by trade but because of an arm wound was not able to continue this work, was trained in American methods of beauty-parlor operation. He worked successfully in several established beauty parlors and now has his own shop, giving employment to a number of native-born.

Those who came to the United States under the Federal DP program have not had the educational and cultural advantages of their predecessors. But they do have manual skills. But, no matter what the background or how terrible their experiences, they have shielded their children and kept them free from the imprint of these hardships.

Their children are in our public schools doing outstanding work. In fact, the week after Junior arrives you will find him outdoors playing tag and other American games with the neighborhood children.

A small and very interesting group of refugees came to us from the Greek-Italian area. At first they posed a problem because of the language difficulties—but it was not long before a group of Atlantans who could speak their language came to our assistance. They served as interpreters and took the newcomers into their own groups. They are now learning English well, have become adjusted and have jobs.

I want to stress the fact that in all of the job placement no newcomer supplanted a native citizen. In making out our assurances we chose the job classifications in which we knew there were local needs for additional workers, and the 146 individuals who are the breadwinners are spread in the following occupations:

Retail sales and services (proprietors)-----	24
Food stores-----	19
Used clothing-----	2
Locksmith-----	1
Beauty salon-----	1
Gift store-----	1
Jobber (importer)-----	1
Garment-trade workers-----	25
Seamstresses-----	11
Tailors-----	5
Machine operators-----	3
Furriers-----	2
Semiskilled-----	4



Building-trades workers-----	10
Painters-----	4
Carpenters-----	3
Electricians-----	2
Bricklayers-----	1
Food industry workers-----	13
Clerks and countermen-----	11
Cooks-----	2
Service trades-----	6
Barbers and hairdressers-----	4
Shoe workers-----	2
Clerical and sales-----	21
Department-store clerks-----	10
Office clerks-----	7
Salesman-----	4
Professional, semiprofessional, and technical-----	17
Physician-----	1
College professor-----	1
Religious functionary-----	1
Laboratory technicians-----	2
Chemists-----	2
Practical nurses-----	3
Printers-----	5
Sign painters-----	2
Semiskilled (furniture workers)-----	4
Machinists and mechanics-----	8
Laborers-----	4
Miscellaneous-----	3
Students and unemployed-----	10
Total-----	146

The employers show satisfaction with their new workers. One employer reports that the six men who work in his factory are all good workers doing splendid jobs, and would serve as good patterns for his employees to follow.

Good office help is difficult to obtain right now. We placed several women in this field, and our reports on them are all excellent.

Though most of the group have not had much in the way of educational advantages, there are a few exceptions, such as two who are professors, one is in the Georgia University system. Mr. X has published scientific monographs in the field of his specialty. Mr. Y is a research assistant in the department of bacteriology in one of our colleges and making outstanding contributions in his special field.

About the same time as these DP's were coming in, we received a group of orphaned teen-agers who came through the assistance of the European Children's Aid, Inc., and were placed under the supervision and care of the Jewish Children's Service in Atlanta. There were 27 girls and boys. All completed their education, most went through high school and a few to college. All who were physically fit have

been or are in the service of the Armed Forces. They have made excellent adjustments. All are self-supporting, except one young man who is still a student in college.

On the whole, I would state that most of our newcomers are happy and have a high morale. However, it is only fair to say that the McCarran-Walter Act has had some effect upon them. Those who understand it have a feeling of anxiety because of it; they do not feel as secure in their new life as they felt prior to its enactment.

In all of our experiences, going back to the earliest records of our refugees and carrying through with the present DP's, we have found not one situation where the individual's loyalty to the United States could be questioned. They are all devoted to the democratic principles. To them United States citizenship is prized much more highly than by the native American. They know what it means to be deprived of this privilege, and they guard their new-found freedom zealously.

I have gone into all of this detail to give you Atlanta's experience, separated as it is into three groups in order to show you why we arrive at the following conclusion. These groups came from distinctly different parts of the world.

All of them have adjusted well. Therefore, we feel that it is not the country of origin that counts but the individual himself, plus the opportunities given him by his American environment, plus the needs of the community.

We feel that any immigration law based upon quotas from countries of origin is not sound. It should reflect the needs and opportunities available in our American communities and be in keeping with our American traditions.

Our naturalized Americans and the aliens legally in our midst should not be regarded with suspicion and in some place with contempt. They are Americans all and help make our country great and glorious as a Nation. Those of us who work with immigrants and know intimately their lives sympathize with their aspirations and ideals and ambitions for themselves and their children to be accepted and integrated into our American ways of life. Our conviction is that our immigration and naturalization laws should help speed this process. To the immigrant America is still the great dream and hope of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Sterne.  
Reverend Sisson, please.

#### **STATEMENT OF REV. REMBERT SISSON, DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT OF THE METHODIST CHURCH OF THE ATLANTA DISTRICT**

Reverend Sisson. I am Rev. Rembert Sisson, district superintendent of the Methodist Church of the Atlanta district, 1630 North Decatur Road, Atlanta.

I have no prepared statement. I will be glad to try to answer any questions that anybody might like to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to make an oral statement?

Reverend Sisson. Well, I have these convictions or feelings about the present situation: that there should not be any substantial changes in our present immigration laws, due to the present conditions in our world. The world is so unsettled, actually in war, and I think per-

haps it would be much better to wait until we can have a more stable situation in our own country and in our world before we make any substantial changes in our immigration laws. There is a struggle on in our world between our way of life and communism; and until we are able to win this fight, determine exactly who is on our side and why, I think we had better keep the people we have and admit very few others.

Commissioner PICKETT. One of the questions we are concerned with is the effect on our foreign policies of our immigration policy and practice. Do you have any observations on that? Does it affect our relations with other countries?

Reverend Sisson. Well, I don't know what the attitudes of other countries would be toward losing their populations. I think most countries would like to keep their populations, and perhaps they might appreciate some restriction in such countries as ours as to who should be admitted, and the numbers that should be admitted.

However, the individual persons in those foreign countries, most of them, would like to become American citizens, I think, as quickly as possible. I was in Europe a couple of years ago, and most of the young people there that I met had one question to ask: "How can I become an American citizen; how can I get to America and become an American citizen?" And I know they want to come, but the governments of those countries might take a different attitude. The individual persons find out likely restrictions, but I think the Government has taken an over-all and a longer view than the individual, perhaps; I don't think it would hurt our foreign policy to have these restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do I understand that you favor that the law be retained as it is?

Reverend Sisson. I think the present quota system is fair. Perhaps it should be adjusted at points, at least enough to take care of situations like where an American soldier might marry some girl overseas, and want to bring his wife or his family home at the end of his service, but I think—I haven't heard of our present quota system creating any ill will.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that the quota system should continue to be based on the 1920 census of our population, or do you think it should be revised on the basis of a later census?

Reverend Sisson. Well, well, I would be willing for that to happen; but sooner or later, I think we are going to have to decide what sort of a nation we are going to be. And whether we are going to be half Asiatics, or whether we are going to be half southern European, or predominantly northern European—I think we are going to have to make those choices, and I think it ought to be made on the basis of the present predominant group in American society.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you take the 1950 census, say, instead of 1920 census figure?

Reverend Sisson. I am not familiar with the difference in those two census views.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Dr. Sisson, one of the problems that has been presented to the Commission particularly by members of the various Protestant clergy is the need for doing something to help the persons of German ethnic origin in Germany and Austria because of the difficulty they have been confronted with in their fight against com-

munism; do you have any views on that, that you would like to express to the Commission?

Reverend Sisson. No, I'm not familiar enough with that situation to have an intelligent statement about it. May I ask a question: what is the difference now, what is the point here—the difference between the 1920 census and the 1952 census, what is the important difference there?

The CHAIRMAN. Well the different nationalities who might be affected by the quota had an entirely different percentage of population in 1950 than they had in 1920.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Have you any personal observation or opinion to express on the question sometimes raised as to whether immigrants from northern Europe integrate more readily into this country than those from southern Europe?

Reverend Sisson. No; no definite comment. I think that perhaps southern Europeans are not as easily integrated as northern Europeans. We seem to have more in common, certainly, in our section of the country, with northern Europeans than we do with southern Europeans. In our section of the country we are predominantly Protestant; they are predominantly Roman Catholic, and their ideas about democracy, and so forth, are in many cases different from ours; and I think the northern European adapts himself more readily than the southern European, ordinarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Sisson.

Is Mr. Weisiger here?

#### STATEMENT OF KENDALL WEISIGER

Mr. WEISIGER. I am Kendall Weisiger, 206 Seventeenth Street, N.E., Atlanta.

Mr. Chairman, when I thought of 154,000 new persons to come into this country in 1 year, I sort of couldn't help from laughing, because I tried to think of a city in Georgia that had 154,000 people. I multiplied your 154,000 by 100 years and you would get 15,100,000 people. I understand it has been estimated by reliable persons that our terrain in the United States could accommodate a population of at least 350,000,000 people, and as you ride about Georgia, as I do a great deal, and see the idle fields and the forests and you could think of how many good people could live on this land and make it a better land, it sort of makes your heart sick.

I haven't thought much about this question of immigration per se, except when my independent indignation arises as I read in the paper or when I talk to my sister in Richmond, who belongs to a national patriotic organization, and I ask her, "Well, what have you all got to do with immigration anyhow; what do you know about it; what is your feeling for it?" I am a telephone man, but I have tried to be and have become, I think, in part, a human, because I classified the soldiers in the Army, I have interviewed over 40,000 men, I have brought to the campuses of Georgia in the past 6 years, 166 students from 41 countries and I have come to look on men as men, whether they are from Africa or Japan or Germany or Austria or Iceland. I think we are living in a very rapidly evolving time. When you think of the past 30 years only, such a short span, half of a span of a man's life, when you think of the great depression around the world,

and what it did to our economy and our people, when you think of the fine men that were lost in the First and Second World Wars, are now being lost in Korea, when you think of the history of England and you read a book called the First One Hundred Thousand, where the flower of the English youth went overboard, so to speak, on the parapets of Normandy in no time at all. When you think of the trouble that our old mother country—mother to many of us in this room—has had since that day, it gives you cause to wonder. When you think of the results of these two wars, plus the one now, and think about America and about our culture and its rapid rate of deterioration, you begin to think a little differently about things like that.

It makes me sad to think of the limitations we put on human beings, and if I leave one thought with you I would like to leave this one: Assuming that a man is a man for all that, and intelligence as the U. N. Nations Committee has shown us so clearly and I have come in my personal observation to know, that there isn't any copyright on intelligence, it goes around the world. My black man from Africa is just as intelligent as any white man in this room, so that boundaries and climate do not change intelligence.

When I think of the quotas—every time I have ever thought of them I have felt sad about it, because it seems to be a completely arbitrary and inhuman thing, if you please. When you think of our needs for new blood, and America is America because of a diversity of blood. When Anglo-Saxons down in this country pride ourselves so much on our heritage and stick out our chests about being Anglo-Saxons, we have little knowledge of the population of the United States, how many Spaniards there are, and how many this, that and the other, if you named them all down the list.

But America is America because it is a composite people, and I thought of that the other day when I read that marvelous article in Life and I felt so sad after I had read about the population of Australia, and when I thought of a pure Anglo-Saxon settlement of that great country, and then I thought how they had self-contained themselves and they wanted no immigrants, they were afraid to death of the Japanese, they cut the immigrant quotas now; then when I thought of the constraint on production in a short workweek of 33 hours and a lot of other things that the writer told about then, and yet I had estimated them to be a great people, and still do, I felt a little concerned as to whether or not if our settlement in America had been confined to the Anglo-Saxon people, particularly from the British Isles, whether we would have today the great America that we have. I don't think we would have.

I think America is what it is, and if I may brag I think it is great, and I don't believe in bragging much, and I have to refrain from bragging to these students because there are so many ineptitudes in America that I hope they won't discover that I don't like to call attention to them; but we are great because we are diverse people.

The first awareness of that, I think, that America had, was a book by the Russell Sage Foundation on immigrant contributions to American life, if you go back and see that; and then we waited a long time for Louis Adamie to come back from his native Yugoslavia to make America conscious of the part that the immigrants had played, and then I thought about my experience at camp in the First World War

when we were sent 33,000 rejects from the camps in the East because they were not thought to be good men, because they could not speak the language and this, that, and the other.

I had charge of interviewing those men, and I remember I took a team of 42 interpreters to give you an idea of the racial strains of those men, and I well remember that morning when the sergeant said to a company of 250 men—that was the size in those days—“all men who understand this command step three paces to the right and form a line on the right.” I looked up and saw 73 men who didn’t understand that command and stood in the rear. I remember. It was called the All-American Division, but I think that was a bad name, it ought to have been called All-World or something of that sort. So that, we do get a great deal in America, and if we could just utilize even in part the skills and abilities and talents that these people bring to us, we could still have an Age of Pericles in America. So I don’t see much use in talking about this matter of immigration, about communism, I wouldn’t mention that at all. I don’t think that’s got anything to do with it. I think we must think of ourselves as a young Nation, still in an evolutionary stage, and that we ought, if practicable—and yet the law makes it difficult, it is too bad that the law should control many intimate things like this—that the thing should be flexible enough in some way that the law might establish a commission of good and intelligent men who could have the authority to, from time to time, make changes within the boundaries set, so that the situation as it changes could be met. We haven’t seen any changes in the situation yet. We will live to see them, and we ought to be getting ready for them.

I would hope that we could adjust ourselves. When you think of the displaced people, when you think of the stories that these students tell me from the first to the latest one from Pakistan, it turns out that his whole family was moved and all his possessions left behind and how sorrowful that makes you. When I think of the stories the girls from the Russian sector of Austria tell me when they come here to school, we have got to be more humanistic about this thing, gentlemen, more compassionate if you please about human beings. They are not statistics; they are flesh and blood.

Now if you want some sort of a scheme for shifting your quotas, which is the most arbitrary thing I have heard of to begin with, I believe that some people would have sense enough to work that out; I would recommend that you appoint a new commission of the biggest people you can find in America in spite of this present law, and let it go on and do whatever damage it is going to do, but that we ought to think ahead for the future, for the next 30 years or 50, and that maybe we could work out a plan of immigration which we might ideally call a sociological plan of immigration. Now if we are going to be selfish about the thing, if we want to keep out Communists or if we don’t want any more South Italians, or if we want more Scandinavians or if we want to ask Holland to send here some of the people that they are paying to send out of Holland to come to Canada because there are immigrants every month that come on that basis, I thought how sad that was for a great country like Holland with all its fine people and what it has contributed to the world. Think of those people paying fine families to pull up roots and go across the sea; isn’t that sad? There are countries that need outlets for their people. There is this

great question of whether we are to be the haven for the orientals—those questions ought not to be just a matter of simple debt; they ought to have the best brains in America behind it, and in the world for that matter, and I hope you can evolve something like that.

I think we ought to open our doors to more good people. And I remember after the war how pleased I was when I heard that they were going to send a crew, sort of like our crew that interviewed the Army, because I helped to interview hundreds of thousands of them, to find their occupational skills and to fit them into the Army where they could produce so that they could win the war, that the Immigration Department is going to send abroad a crew who could interview the people.

I think you ought to have something like that. If you can spend the money as we do here to interview every applicant for the Federal Government—and I have something to do with that myself, in other words, to keep out subversives—if we can spend that money we might spend money to put some outposts in use abroad. I would put that in skill, because a man ought to bring some skill and we can always use it. I would put it on moral character and I would put it on purpose and I would not dismember families. We dismembered when we brought the Negroes in, that was one of the worst. So that consideration ought to be given to the family in particular.

I don't believe we ought to pay so much attention to the prospect of tuberculosis in the lungs of these people, or in the old father of this sad family. We can cure that lung up here; we have done it. I cured a boy from Korea that came here to Emory University and got him cured. He is now in our Navy. So I wouldn't pay so much attention to those things and have those restrictions unflexible and unchangeable boundaries, which you put a human being in a pair of calipers before he can become a citizen of America.

I didn't mean to make all that speech, Mr. Chairman. It may be a little bit out of place. But I thought while I had you here I had better tell you what I thought about it. May I say that I am a pure amateur in this field. I thought about it last night after I was called, early this morning while I was eating breakfast, and these contacts that I have had, as I have related to you, to give you a little background, have put me in a position to see human beings as human beings, and I am often tired of all these mechanical constrictions and limitations that we put on people, and I do think America can still take a great number of people, and I have had to do a lot with the Latvians, they were persons mentioned here, and they are wonderful people. If I were the King I would go to Sweden and rescue every displaced Estonian there was and bring them to America. I hope to bring 100 of them at least. They are fine people, fine stock, and if we are going to be selfish we could discriminate a little bit on the kind of people we want to open our doors to.

Now, that would bring up a lot of thought. But still we could do that. If we are going to make arbitrary quotas on geographical boundaries we could by the same token make arbitrary limitations on the kind of people we are going to bring, and I don't see why we shouldn't just go on and admit that we are selfish about this. It is our country that our forefathers developed; we are responsible for it; we want to see it grow and develop and we do need new blood, therefore, there are no two ways about that.

If there is anybody who has got any idea because you cross up human beings and create new blood streams that you are making a sorry people, that just ain't so. The biologists to the contrary notwithstanding, and America is America because it is; I am a hybrid and I am darn proud of it; and I know many other hybrids, and I know the good qualities that come into a family from good blood streams.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much for giving us the benefit of your views.

I understand that you are trustee and secretary of the Rotary Educational Foundation.

Mr. WEISIGER. Yes; founder of it.

The CHAIRMAN. And is that for the country or for the State?

Mr. WEISIGER. It was originally formulated in order to keep good men who were dropping out of college for lack of money, and we have in the 30 years—we just closed last month—been the means of keeping 1,405 men in college who otherwise might have dropped out; and out of the interest on the loan—we charge interest because it is a business transaction—we have used that money to bring to Georgia colleges as many as 83 students from these 41 countries of the world, and the rest of the rotaries have done the same thing in Georgia, so that we have set this pattern of bringing students from abroad to the campuses of Georgia, and when you have contact with people like that you come to see human beings through different eyes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand correctly that you would make no distinction between one part of Europe and another, or as between Europe and Asia as any other part of the world?

Mr. WEISIGER. My dear brother, the extraction of prejudices from the human breast and out of the blood stream or wherever they are, I have found is one of the most tedious jobs I have ever attempted, and I have devoted myself for many years to the Commission on Interracial Cooperation as between whites and Negroes in Atlanta.

I am trustee of three Negro colleges. I do for a Negro the same as I do for a white man. I have done for Christian and Jews, and by the same token have worn out shoe leather begging for them. I have tried to remove prejudice, and I hope all of you will, but it is a tedious job. If I could get my brothers of the cloth to spend more time in extracting prejudices, then I think you could do it, but if you call on me, you give me a chance to make another speech.

I think if you develop in your breast the human compassion that I have been writing about recently and speaking on, that you will drive out your prejudices and be like a new leaf on a tree pushing out the old leaf. Now, I don't believe I would approach that on the basis of prejudice. I believe if you really wanted to approach that scientifically, you might take that idea of immigrant contribution to American life and follow that out to the end and see which countries have made the most contributions, see?

I have interviewed hundreds of short-bodied Italian-Sicilian extract workers from the New York Central Railroad, and out of the steel plants, and they fought a mighty good fight in the Eighty-second Division, where they belonged in the Ammunition Corps and Engi-



neering Corps. I think we have gotten off the track, many of us who have been to school, reading the great—I will think of the name in a minute, the fellow who wrote all the books about anthropology and put the Anglo Saxon man No. 1 in the list, that is the man around the Baltic Sea. Breasted is what his name was, and he has got great books on it. Breasted said the men from the British Isles, from Scandinavia, from the Baltic countries, were the No. 1 men in the world.

Why? Because they have been conditioned for that by moisture, by climate, by cyclonic changes in temperature, by eking out a living out of a rugged soil—and we have got New England to duplicate that as an illustration for us—they made the No. 1 man. But that doesn't mean that the No. 2 men aren't pretty good, and maybe the No. 10 men, for that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you saying that, in your personal opinion, a human being, no matter where he comes from, if given the opportunity, will make the same contribution?

Mr. WEISIGER. I didn't quite say that.

The CHAIRMAN. I am trying to find out what you did mean.

Mr. WEISIGER. That isn't my idea. My idea is that a man is a man and men are in stratas intellectually and skillfully, and from the standpoint of honor, which are the three important things—we can stratify men, we have got too many of the dishonorable class in this country, we ought to try to get more honorable people. But I would have some feeling about that, yes. The Italian people are not a homogeneous people. The Lombards are very fine people and have made very fine contributions and are skilled mechanics, Italians, remember, and are great artists and things of that sort.

I would wonder whether you could split a country in two with a parallel like we did in Korea and say "these don't and these do," and that's where you have got a tedious job. But I believe if you set up a new sort of a gage, if it were practicable to do such a thing, and you gaged men by not only health—which is important, but slight deficiencies in health can be overcome, we know so much more now than we did before, and we can do so much better by an ailing man than we could 30 years ago, and then we can measure that in the Army with the trade tests, that is very simple and a man's record will give you his skill. I shouldn't see why we shouldn't have a case record in complete detail on every prospective immigrant. And if you want to be selfish and be choosy, to sort those fellows out by a composite of their past record of honorable dealings and living and family life, and responsibility, and participation in the community life and in the Government of the country. That would be a nice job to do. I would like to live long enough to get into that. But I believe it would be justified with 154,000 people. There are 33,000 men in one Army division here. You take four of them and you have nearly got your whole crowd.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. WEISIGER. I'm sorry to take so much time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming down here.

Professor McKay, please.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT B. McKAY, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF LAW,  
EMORY UNIVERSITY**

Professor McKAY. I am Robert B. McKay, associate professor of law at Emory University Law School.

I have a prepared statement which I will read, if you wish.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall be pleased to hear it.

Professor McKAY. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 is the latest in a series of congressional enactments dealing with the most acute policy problem of our day—the reconciliation of the conflict of American interests between national security and what might be called the spirit of liberty. By the latter I mean something more than the narrow legalistic interpretation of the phrases of the Constitution on which our free society is based. Rather I have in mind the motivating concept of democracy which embraces freedom of speech and thought and due process for all persons within the United States. My concern is whether we have not perhaps turned the balance too far in favor of internal security at the expense of our precious spirit of liberty. Alan Barth, in his book, *The Loyalty of Free Men*, has expressed his similar concern strongly, but effectively: “Nothing that the agents of communism have done or can do in this country is so dangerous to the United States as what they have induced us \* \* \* to do to ourselves.”

Since the problems are difficult, reasonable men will of course differ in their proposed solutions. Accordingly, the carefully objective study which this Commission is giving the question is a salutary sign of the continuing vitality of our democratic framework. I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate.

The Immigration and Nationality Act was designed “to enact a completely revised immigration and nationality code” (Conference Report No. 2096, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 1). As such, it is necessarily a long and complex piece of legislation. I intend to comment on only a few sections, particularly in view of judicial construction of the parallel predecessor sections of previous acts. I shall confine myself to provisions which I find disturbing in connection with exclusion and deportation of aliens and denaturalization of certain classes of citizens.

First, let me state what I conceive to be the proper frame of reference in which to consider these problems, particularly in connection with aliens. The admission, restriction on activities, and expulsion of aliens has always been considered a fundamental attribute of sovereignty. Equally, however, it has long been recognized that aliens are entitled to procedural due process once they have been admitted to the country. Yet there has been, I believe, in recent years a subtle but nonetheless discernible judicial movement toward increased deference to congressional determination of necessity.

Congress has acted, and acted appropriately, I believe, on the assumption that the threat of Communist power outside the United States and of Communist conspiracy within is neither fantasy nor pretense (*Harisiades v. Shaughnessy*, 342 U. S. 580, 590 (1952)). The courts have concurred in this judgment and, accepting the legislative finding of extreme peril, have almost uniformly approved the legislative schemes to cope with the Communist threat. Thus, Mr. Justice

Jackson, in *Harisiades v. Shaughnessy* (342 U. S. 580, 591 (1952)), put it this way:

We think that, in the present state of the world, it would be rash and irresponsible to reinterpret our fundamental law to deny or qualify the Government's power of deportation. However desirable world-wide amelioration of the lot of aliens, we think it is peculiarly a subject for international diplomacy. It should not be initiated by judicial decision which can only deprive our own Government of a power of defense and reprisal without obtaining for American citizens abroad any reciprocal privileges or immunities. Reform in this field must be entrusted to the branches of the Government in control of our international relations and treaty-making powers.

Refusing to express his own views on the legislation, Mr. Justice Jackson also stated:

\* \* \* we have an act of one Congress which, for a decade, subsequent Congresses have never repealed, but have strengthened and extended. We, in our private opinions, need not concur in Congress' policies to hold its enactments constitutional. Judicially we must tolerate what personally we may regard as a legislative mistake (*Id.* 590).

Judge Learned Hand, dissenting in *United States v. Shaughnessy* (195 F. 2d 964, 971 (2d Cir. 1952), cert. granted, October 13, 1952), spoke of the problem thus:

Think what one may of a statute based upon such fears, when passed by a society which professes to put its faith in the free interchange of ideas, a court has no warrant for refusing to enforce it. If that society chooses to flinch when its principles are put to the test, courts are not set up to give it derring-do.

It is accordingly perfectly evident that, in the face of the current state of crisis in world affairs, courts are willing to rely very substantially on the congressional estimate of the steps which must be taken to protect American security. Under this prevailing judicial concept the courts have gone far to ratify the increasingly unenviable position in which Congress has placed aliens. Consider, for example, the following legislative-judicial pronouncements:

(1) The United States may constitutionally deport a legally resident alien because of his membership in the Communist Party, although that membership was terminated before the enactment of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, in this case, before it was even enacted. The deportation was held not to be in conflict with the first or fifth amendments of the Constitution, nor within the ban of the ex post facto prohibition (*Harisiades v. Shaughnessy*, 342 U. S. 580 (1952)).

(2) The United States may exclude without hearing the alien wife of a citizen who served honorably in the United States Armed Forces during World War II, the exclusion being based solely upon a finding by the Attorney General, with no requirement that he disclose his reasons (*Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U. S. 537 (1950)).

(3) The Attorney General, with no important control over his exercise of discretion, may detain without bail aliens held for deportation hearings on the charge of membership in a proscribed group (*Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U. S. 524 (1952)).

(4) Deportation proceedings are no longer subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. See, for discussion of Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1951 which so provides (*Barber v. Yanish*, 196 F. 2d 53 (9th Cir. 1952), cert. denied, October 13, 1952).

The only important decision out of line with the foregoing trend of rulings is *United States ex rel. Mazei v. Shaughnessy* (195 F. 2d 964 (2d Cir. 1952), cert. granted, October 13, 1952). In that case an alien who had resided in the United States for 25 years was held excludable upon return from a visit abroad. The exclusion order was unreviewable, the alien having been found a bad security risk by the Attorney General. But no other country was found which would accept the alien, and the Attorney General was thereupon willing to hold him indefinitely insofar as he was excluded from this country and could not be accepted by any other country. On petition for habeas corpus Judge Clark of the second circuit ruled that the Attorney General could not hold him indefinitely, and that to do so would be a violation of the fifth amendment not required by the relevant provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Judge Learned Hand dissented, and the Supreme Court has granted the Government a review. Reversal of this single decision questioning the power of Congress seems at least very possible.

Indeed, Congress has been quick to seize on these decisions and carry them to the outermost limits of their logic—perhaps even a little beyond, with the result that the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 is even more restrictive in a number of respects than previous legislation. Congress declares there is a legislative need for such restrictions on aliens or other citizens. The courts affirm it.

In view, then, of the judicial determination that these results are required by the present situation, it appears that, to the extent that corrective action is necessary, it must come from Congress rather than from the courts. It is accordingly a time for high statesmanship because these are difficult problems, and it is hard to say we shouldn't plunge ourselves on the side of certain security, that rather we should protect our traditions and our spirit of liberty for responsible law-making; and I am accordingly glad that this Commission is making this advisory study.

Without suggesting the details of legislative recommendations, let me call attention briefly to those areas in which I believe legislative reform is needed.

(1) Section 212 (a) (28). The prohibitions on admission to this country of aliens who have ever been members of Communist or other totalitarian groups seems too far-reaching, even discounting the limited exceptions provided in subparagraph (I).

(2) Section 241. Because deportation proceedings are said not to be criminal in nature, the *ex post facto* provisions of the Constitution are inapplicable here; despite the fact that Mr. Justice Brandeis said that deportation of an alien from the country in which he has taken up residence, made his home for many years, takes away from him the things that makes life worth living, so Congress has made the most of this opportunity to provide for deportation of aliens for membership or affiliation with subversive groups that occurred before the ban was imposed, and for activity long discontinued.

(3) Section 242 (a). This confirms and strengthens the discretionary authority of the Attorney General to hold aliens without bail when a deportation hearing is pending.

(4) Sections 350, 352. Without further specific comment I should like to mention that even certain classes of citizens are made more

likely to lose their American citizenship without power to prevent such loss. I refer of course to dual citizens and naturalized citizens.

In conclusion, then, it appears that the cycle of ever-tightening congressional restrictions followed by judicial approval, in turn followed by further legislative strictures, and so forth, deserves examination to determine whether, as former Attorney General Biddle feared, "our institutions do not have the sturdiness which our words to the rest of the world announce, and will falter under the greater impact of the alien dogma."

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Burgess here?

### STATEMENT OF DAVID BURGESS, SECRETARY OF THE GEORGIA CIO COUNCIL

Mr. BURGESS. I am David Burgess, 95 Merritt Avenue NE., Atlanta. I represent the Georgia CIO Council, of which I am the secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I come here today as an amateur, but one who is, I believe, concerned about this problem since I grew up in a foreign land in China, and I think I have a slightly different point of view than some people on this question; second, my testimony bears largely on the labor situation in the South and the relationship to this law, or the revision thereof.

I think you gentlemen understand that the South up to very recently, and almost at the present time is not a part of the country in which we have had many immigrants, with the exception of those forcibly brought here on the slave ships, and therefore we have had up to the time of the War Between the States a white group, which was in predominance, and a slave group. One out of every five persons of white skin owned a Negro; four did not. It was an agricultural economy, and therefore up to rather recently has had no use in some ways for the skills and the abilities that some of our, say, south Europeans have brought to the other parts of this country.

The War Between the States left the South desolate, and in 1880 we were more or less pulled out of our condition by the introduction of industry, largely locally owned. The labor was brought from the farms, native Anglo Saxon white labor, and it was docile, and we have had the economic conditions in the South partly as a result of this situation.

This situation has created a type of in-breeding, a type of bigotry which we in Georgia are now facing in this current election. I have an example of it right in front of me in which not only the Negro is villified, but every person with a Jewish name, a non-Anglo Saxon name, or any other name is held under suspicion; and, therefore, our bigots can play on this situation more easily than they could in other countries where, though you are prejudiced yourself, you cannot make a public appeal to prejudice and serve in a public office.

Now in recent years, there has been a new industrial situation in the South; more and more industries are coming down here not only to escape good wage conditions in the North, but because the future market, the raw materials are closer, and the potentiality of economic growth is ever more challenging. Therefore, we need in the South today more than ever before new skills; I mean, speaking purely of technical skills in industry, that many Europeans have and can share

with us. I think that Dr. Pickett knows that when the American Friends Service Committee during World War II brought people over, Jewish refugees and others from Europe, that every one of them contributed not only his own skills but brought new skills and new ideas which, in turn, brought more employment to more people.

We in the South need more skills, particularly in industry, and more purchasing power; you need more art, more literature, more writers, more services, and a greater economy in the broad sense of the word.

Now, the effect of immigration into the South from foreign countries would be good; it would give us more variety, more understanding, and I think more of an open heart.

Now this is not only a southern problem, but every act of Congress is now a world problem. The promise on the Statue of Liberty, with the coming of the McCarran Act and with the recent interpretations of the Supreme Court, have flaunted the very ideal that we in America believe in.

Now having grown up in the Orient, I know that the passage of the Oriental Exclusion Act in the early twenties, for which labor was partly responsible, the AFL in those days, was the chief club used on us and is still used on us all over the Orient, first in the war with Japan and their colonial policy, and now in the race of Nazism in Indonesia and other places. An act of Congress is not only national and regional, it is a world act and, as such, has to be recognized as that; and when it is written into the law that any race, color, creed, nationality, is discriminated against, that thought carries to other people.

I think the conscience of the American people is rather dependent on one point and, that is, if we can figure out the number of just who are cremated, who are not able to get out, who were caught or seized or dependent on entry into other countries, who did not come to America when they hoped to come to America and, therefore, fell into the hands of the Gestapo, I think we are in a way responsible for their deaths and we have to atone for them.

Now, what are the general principles for which the organized labor movement in America stands in relation to the general principles of writing a law? First, if there has to be a quota system, some restriction, the restriction ought to be on a total number rather than the place of origin, because as has already been explained here, the northern Europeans are not in great need of the desire to come to America and settle in this country. Sweden, Norway, England, Scotland, Ireland, generally those people do not use up their quotas, therefore, why should other people be held out because they are not, through no action of their own, born in those northern countries?

Second, I agree with our lawyer friend who just testified. There has to be some check on subversion. Now and then an alien has slipped in and done things, but when you consider the lack of sabotage in World War II and subsequently, I think the whole question of subversion is brought into its correct light, it is not really a problem in relationship to folks from abroad.

Third, I think there has to be important distinctions between temporary aliens who are brought in for labor purposes and people who wish to make their homes here. There is a very important distinction.

Back in 1942 when I was with the Congregational church I served in the southern part of Florida among migrant workers, and I can testify there that most of the folks were from Georgia, at least the first few months of my stay, in this migrant FSA camp.

Then we were forcibly ejected from the camp for a shipment or group of Puerto Ricans and Bahamians to take our places in the fields at a reduced rate.

Now I know you gentlemen are not concerned with that, but I think there has to be a distinction between the two types of residences in this country. The wetback situation in California that you gentleman are acquainted with is another problem, and labor objects to sponsoring residency to people who are undermining the labor standards in this country. However, that is not the same as a laborer or skilled person or anybody else from foreign countries who wishes to make his home here. That is completely different, because they have pulled up stakes, they are not coming because someone has brought them to undermine somebody else. They have come from the freedom of their own desire, because we are not recruiting labor like in the old days from Europe. They want to make their homes here, and we should allow them to come here.

Finally, I think we in America who believe that our strength rests fundamentally in freedom of thought and freedom of expression and that no man shall control a person's beliefs, just his actions, that we cannot follow in the way of Russia, that is punishing people for past errors for which they have asked forgiveness for their sins. We cannot develop an iron curtain instituted by Congress to keep out south Europeans, to keep out Jews, to keep out orientals, to keep out Negroes who wish to make their homes here.

I think this is the basic fundamental principle which distinguishes us at least in theory so far, from those against whom we struggle in this great world-wide struggle of today.

Commissioner PICKETT. Would it be a fair question to ask you how far you speak for the CIO? And how far you speak only for yourself?

Mr. BURGESS. I am the official spokesman for the CIO in Georgia. I am their representative on legislative matters. I won't say I speak for people of any other State but I made sure my testimony is in conformance with the national CIO policy on their regulations in annual conventions, and I can speak for myself and the Georgia CIO Council and for no other.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you in Georgia?

Mr. BURGESS. In Georgia for a year and in the South for 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you before?

Mr. BURGESS. North and South Carolina and Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. And represented CIO for 10 years?

Mr. BURGESS. Since 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. You said you were raised in China?

Mr. BURGESS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. How old were you when you came to this country?

Mr. BURGESS. Only 11, but my father was back since then and we have kept our contacts since that time with the Chinese. He was a missionary. He also served in UNNRA during the war for training people for service in China.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. BURGESS. Born here but went out there when I was about 2 months old.

The CHAIRMAN. They took you?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Is Monsignor Castel here?

**STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. WILLIAM J. CASTEL, DIRECTOR, ARCHDIOCESAN RESETTLEMENT, BUREAU OF THE CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW ORLEANS; MEMBER OF THE STATE COMMITTEE OF DISPLACED PERSONS; NEW ORLEANS RESETTLEMENT COMMITTEE; APPEARING ALSO IN BEHALF OF OTHER PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN NEW ORLEANS**

The CHAIRMAN. Monsignor, will you give the reporter your full title and address, and name, please?

Monsignor CASTEL. The Right Reverend Monsignor William Castel, director, archdiocesan resettlement, Bureau of the Archdiocese of New Orleans, La.; member of the State committee of displaced persons and the New Orleans Resettlement Committee, which is a composite of various religious groups and civic organizations in the State of Louisiana.

I am here representing the New Orleans Committee for Displaced Persons. We are in charge of the receiving and sending forward out of the city the displaced persons who came through the port of New Orleans.

On behalf of Rev. Albert D'Orlando, minister of the First Unitarian Church, New Orleans; Rev. Dana Dawson, Jr., chairman, department of civil affairs, New Orleans Council of Churches; Rev. W. D. Langtry, president, New Orleans Ministerial Union; Mrs. Moise W. Demery, president, New Orleans section, National Council of Jewish Women; Clarence M. East, Jr., representing Catholic Committee of the South; and myself, I wish to read a prepared statement, to which we have all subscribed.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear it.

Monsignor CASTEL. We as representatives of broad segments of religious and social life in metropolian New Orleans desire to go on record in agreement with the following positions in regard to the present immigration policy of the United States.

In general we reaffirm and restate our belief that the national greatness of our country rests upon its unique facility in providing a climate for living in which those of other lands, although varying widely in religious, economic, and cultural background, can find common acceptance. We likewise believe that the progress and expansion of our Nation has been directly dependent on immigration as a vital source of its manpower. We renounce that outmoded philosophy of racism which seeks to discriminate between ethnic and religious groups on the basis of supposed inherent inferiorities. More particularly we fear any implication that our Nation accepts any part of that philosophy, particularly at this crucial point in history when the United States is faced with the responsibility of providing world-wide moral leadership for those nations and peoples whose eyes look hopefully toward us.



Specifically we oppose the following policies among others in existing immigration statutes:

(1) Discrimination against orientals in the standards for determining nationality.

(2) Discrimination practiced against those countries hardest hit by war in charging displaced persons previously sent to this country against the quotas for those countries.

(3) Lack of any provision for reallocating unused quotas so as to permit full utilization of the over-all quota.

(4) Denial of judicial review as incompatible with American principles of justice.

In the interest of brevity we have stated only those features which seem to us most injurious in the present law. There are other objectionable features about which we might express ourselves, if the Commission desires a fuller statement in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Monsignor CASTEL. I also wish to tender to this Commission a statement from the National Council of Jewish Women, New Orleans section, who asked me to present this statement, wherein they amplify their own position in regard to the McCarran-Walter bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be inserted in the record.

(There follows the statement submitted by the National Council of Jewish Women, New Orleans section:)

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, NEW ORLEANS SECTION,  
NEW ORLEANS, LA.

(Mrs. Moise W. Denney, president, 3132 Nashville Avenue)

(Mrs. Louise Convat, corresponding secretary, 2512 Jefferson Avenue)

MR. PHILLIP B. PERLMAN,

*Chairman, President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,  
Atlanta, Ga.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The New Orleans section of the National Council of Jewish Women is pleased to have this opportunity to express its views on the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States. We are particularly concerned with section (c) of the President's order establishing a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization.

The new Immigration and Naturalization Act, which will become effective on December 24, 1952, retains the theory of "national origins" introduced into immigration policy in the quota law of 1921. It reflects distrust of the stranger and the fear that aliens are potential subversive elements. It is difficult to reconcile this attitude with the American tradition of offering refuge to the oppressed and the United States' position in world leadership today.

The Immigration Act of 1952 still retains the racist and restrictive philosophy of the national-origin system with its limitation on movement of persons born in southern and eastern Europe and weighing in favor of immigrants born in Great Britain and Ireland. It is still based on the 1920 census even though 1940 and 1950 censuses are available.

This restriction on the movement of persons born in eastern and southern Europe is particularly difficult to accept in 1952 when the immigrants who are most desirous of coming to America and who need the opportunity for immigration the most are persons born in limited-quota areas, such as escapees from iron-curtain countries. Certainly some recognition and some additional provisions should be made to relieve the distress of the many unfortunate victims of political oppression not only for humanitarian reasons but also to demonstrate effectively the moral right of the United States to assume world leadership.

Provisions were embodied in some of the other bills on immigration and naturalization to allow for the pooling of unused quotas. This concept would have enabled the use of unused numbers each year and would have made possible the entry of hundreds of victims of persecution each year without in-

creasing the total number of allowable immigrants. As the law now stands, the large quotas made available to Great Britain are seldom filled, while the numbers allocated to western Europe are piteously inadequate.

In the 1952 act, the President is given the right to curtail immigrations of all aliens or of a class of aliens if he finds that their admission would be detrimental to the interest of the United States. No authority is given, however, either to the President or to an immigration commission to provide for emergency assistance to people in critically overpopulated areas of western Europe or to provide a haven for refugees and displaced persons, homeless as the result of political upheaval.

The New Orleans Section of the National Council of Jewish Women feels that provisions should be made for (1) a thorough revaluation of our basis for establishing quotas, (2) for the pooling of unused quotas, and (3) for authority to render emergency assistance to victims of oppression.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there any oral statement you wanted to make yourself?

Monsignor CASTEL. I would only like to say this, perhaps: that, in our relationship with these immigrants who came through our port, I must say that all faiths worked together hand in glove in the city of New Orleans to implement the receiving and sending forward the displaced persons who were sent through our port. I have had some members of the Catholic committee working at times at the Jewish desks, and we have had Methodist and Baptist women working on Catholic desks in the receiving of these people, and in the processing of them through the line. Not in all the time we were receiving the displaced persons were there any discriminations as far as I could observe or as far as our committee as a whole observed or reported.

I don't think ever did I hear one complaint where anyone was discriminated against. We had a volunteer motor corps made up of, I would say, the finest ladies of the city of New Orleans, drawn from all faiths and no faiths; and these ladies drove their cars up on the docks and received the immigrants, the displaced persons, just as they came through the processing lines, whether through the Jewish group or through the Catholic group or through Church World Service, just as they came, regardless of religious belief.

The Jewish group, I must say, always gave us a larger number of motor corps, but the reason was that they took them to their own center, which was far beyond the other end of the city, and so the going was a little bit tough. It consumed a lot of time, and nevertheless the Jewish ladies volunteered to increase their numbers when the boats were arriving.

Regardless of that, all worked to the same end of trying to welcome and trying to help these people along their way to their final destination.

Commissioner PICKETT. How many came in under that act?

Monsignor CASTEL. Offhand, I think we speak of 18,000 to 20,000. I don't recall exactly. I am not sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Throughout the State of Louisiana?

Monsignor CASTEL. That is right. Not the State of Louisiana for the reception of these people. Many of them went to New York through our port, but principally they were going through the South and through the West from the port of New Orleans.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Monsignor.

We will take a recess now until 1:30 o'clock this afternoon, when we will reconvene in courtroom 318.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the Commission recessed until 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

# HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

---

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1952

ATLANTA, GA.

## TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

The President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization met at 1:30 p. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom 318, Old Post Office Building, Atlanta, Ga., Hon. Philip B. Perlman (chairman) presiding.

Present: Chairman Philip B. Perlman and the following Commissioners: Mr. Thomas G. Finucane, Dr. Clarence E. Pickett, Msgr. John O'Grady.

Also present: Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commission will come to order.

The first witness on our schedule this afternoon is J. C. Holton.

### STATEMENT OF J. C. HOLTON, ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONER, GEORGIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AND SECRETARY OF THE GEORGIA DISPLACED PERSONS COMMITTEE

MR. HOLTON. I am J. C. Holton, assistant to the commissioner, Georgia State Department of Agriculture. I am also secretary of the Georgia Displaced Persons Committee which was appointed by the Governor.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to hear it.

MR. HOLTON. In response to letter dated September 24, 1952, received from Hon. Harry N. Rosenfield, executive director, President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, outlining procedure to be followed at the hearing to be held in room 416, Old Post Office Building, Atlanta, October 17, 1952, Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture and immigration, and chairman, Georgia Displaced Persons Committee, invited the following to participate in a prehearing conference October 10, in order to develop a general policy representing the opinion of the various groups in Georgia:

Hon. Ben Fortson, secretary of state

Hon. Sid Truitt, county agent, Fulton County

Hon. Zack D. Cravey, comptroller general

Hon. Clark Gaines, secretary, department of commerce

Hon. Walter S. Brown, associate director, extension service

Hon. Ben T. Huie, commissioner of labor

Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. James McNamara

Dr. Gregor Sebba, College of Business Administration, University of Georgia  
 Dr. C. C. Murray, dean and director, College of Agriculture  
 Dr. T. F. Sellers, director, department of health  
 Mr. W. H. Holsenbeck, Georgia Association of Soil-Conservation Supervisors  
 Judge Alan Kemper, director, department of welfare  
 Mr. D. W. Brooks, director, Cotton Producers Association  
 Dean Gates, College of Business Administration, University of Georgia

This conference seemed appropriate, as the announced purpose of the hearing is to study and evaluate the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States, the quota system, and the McCarran-Walter immigration law recently enacted by Congress and passed over the President's veto. Special attention will also be devoted to the administration of our immigration laws, admission of immigrants, and the effect refugee and other immigrants may have on the economic status of our country.

The presiding officer, Commissioner Linder, presented the following historical background and observations:

No immigrants should be allowed to enter this country at least for a period of years sufficient to permit better distribution and taking of stock of our over-all economy to insure the safety of this country in the future.

The imbalance of population to which large numbers of immigrants have contributed a major part is the great weakness of the Nation.

During the years of our great strength as a Nation, farm population, urban population and production, both agriculturally and industrially, were in much better balance than they are today.

A century ago, using approximate round figures, 85 percent of the population lived on the land and 15 percent in towns and cities. Over the years there was gradual and steady emigration from the farms to the towns and cities. However, the relatively high birth rate in rural areas and the relatively low birth rate in towns and cities tended to keep a strong rural population well distributed, especially in the main agricultural areas.

The erection of tariff walls created great demand for American industrial products. As a result, industrial centers sprang up in the Nation, and industrial and business populations continued a gradual increase.

#### EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION IN UNLIMITED NUMBERS

In 1903, in order to defeat the labor movement which was then beginning to become a strong factor, Congress enacted immigration laws to permit the importation of surplus labor into the United States to create a cheap labor market.

The great industrialists of that day, not satisfied with Federal legislation alone, went into the several States and secured passage of legislation setting up immigration authorities. As an illustration, in the State of Georgia the legislature passed an act making the commissioner of agriculture *ex officio* commissioner of immigration.

Under the open-door policy of the 1903 legislation, some 11,000,000 immigrants, mostly from Italy and Germany, came into this country. Many of them, of course, were followed in a few years by their families. These people were accustomed to hard labor and low living standards.

It was during those years that the slums and tenement sections of our larger cities had their greatest increase. It was also during that period that political machines in our larger cities began to rise to dominant places of power in State and national politics.

World War I, which created unprecedented demands for industrial and agricultural products, cause the enlargement of industrial enterprises, transportation facilities, and business of every kind. As a result, wages in town took a rapid rise and all surplus labor was drawn away from the farmers. This accentuated the imbalance between rural and urban populations.

At the end of World War I there was a great let-down. The presidential election came on in 1920. Cotton was selling around 40 cents a pound when the farmers began to harvest their 1920 crop. But the market broke and cotton went to 8 cents. Other agricultural crops suffered similar losses. As a result of this, other millions left the farms and went to town, still further increasing the urban population and decreasing the rural population.

## IMPORTING POVERTY

From the presidential election of 1920 to the presidential election of 1928, under guise of collecting war debts, we imported 43 billion dollars of foreign goods. Out of this the Goulds, the Rothschilds, the Morgans, and other international bankers were paid the billions of dollars they had loaned England, France, Italy, and Holland during the first 2 years of World War I. This was not the debt of the American people; it was the debt of Europeans. But the international bankers could not possibly collect from a bankrupt Europe; so they collected out of the American people by selling us goods which we should have produced for ourselves.

As a result of the importation of this 43 billion dollars of goods of all kinds, millions of Americans were thrown out of jobs; they walked the streets; they depended on soup kitchens and free lunches; they sold apples; and they resorted to every device to maintain a bare existence. People on the farms were in like distress. Many farmers lost their land; share croppers and tenants, not having a soup kitchen on the farm, went to town. This still further accentuated the imbalance of population.

After World War I many Europeans and Asiatics were brought into this country. Very few of these new immigrants were able to be absorbed into our economy, and most of those who did not join the soup-kitchen gang joined up with other gangs like Al Capone in Chicago and similar gangs in other cities. In Chicago, New York, and other large cities, whole sections became foreign in thought, in speech, and in loyalty. America had taken to her bosom millions that had no love for American ways. Their only desire apparently was to turn the United States into another Europe or Asia.

## AMERICA DECLINES

After World War II the foreign elements, un-American in their thinking, had become so numerous and vocal they demanded that the doors of America be thrown open to derelicts from many countries. Apparently great secrecy has superadded to the handling of immigrants, and the American people will probably never know how many millions have been brought in this country during the last 7 years that are not naturalized. Irrefutably the fact is, according to the United States Bureau of Census, that approximately 85 percent of our total population now live in towns and cities and only 15 percent are rural citizens. Of this 15 percent many commute daily to some town or city government project or other public work.

According to the Bureau of Census, in August 1951 only 7,700,000 people were actually employed in agriculture. Eight months later in April 1952, 800,000 of these had left the farm and gone to join the other millions in urban jobs, leaving only 6,900,000 actually employed in agriculture.

## SCIENCE AND INVENTION

Because of scientific developments in agriculture and mechanical inventions, it has become possible for 6,900,000 people to produce food and fiber for 156,000,000 people. Equal improvements have been made scientifically and mechanically as to industry, transportation, etc. Even a great volume of the labor in offices and accounting houses is now done by machines which take the place of numbers of workers.

Not only have the men of the farms gone to town and got a job, but the women also.

If 6,900,000 people under modern conditions can produce agricultural products for 156,000,000, it is also true that the many millions engaged in industry can produce industrial products sufficient for several times our population. The only thing that now limits our production of consumer goods is our production of war material and equipment of all kinds.

## EXPLOITATION OF RESOURCES

In order to get raw materials to keep approximately 55,000,000 people in jobs other than agriculture, it has been necessary to exploit and squander our natural resources of all kinds. Petroleum, coal, iron, copper, zinc, timber, and all other natural resources have been drained at a rate never dreamed of before. As a result, we are rapidly becoming dependent on foreign countries to supply us with materials and facilities of all kinds.

## GIVING AWAY A NECESSARY PART OF OUR PRESENT ECONOMY

Having shifted our population to towns and cities and having created jobs for producing enormous amounts of goods, it is necessary to give away a large part of these goods in order to keep the wheels of industry turning. Whether we carry on this give-away program under a pretext of making friends in foreign countries, whether we carry on a pretext of Marshall plans to build up the economy of other nations, or whether we carry it on in the guise of preparing for another world war, the economy all adds up to the same thing. We are rapidly reaching the point where our economy is comparable to that of Great Britain. We are rapidly reaching the point when our economy must fall of its own weight.

If we do not make a radical change in our economy, Europeans coming to America will find that they have simply jumped out of the frying pan into the fire. Like cause produces like effect. We cannot survive as a strong nation with a one-sided economy any more than Great Britain or Germany could survive with a one-sided economy. It was the one-sided overdevelopment of industry in Germany and England and the resultant competition for foreign trade that brought on World War I and all the ills that followed in its wake. It was the industrial rebirth of Germany that brought on World War II. Germany was destroyed a second time by the armies of the world, but Great Britain has been as effectively destroyed economically and politically by the unbalance of its national economy. We now find ourselves in substantially the same economic category that Great Britain occupied in 1914 when World War I began.

## NO MORE IMMIGRANTS NOW

Any immigrants brought into this country at this time can only add to our problem. Additional immigrants are bound, in a large measure, to come to rest in our urban centers. Socialistic and communistic ideas are already rampant in those centers.

The last Congress passed an act to prevent any further large number of immigrants coming into this country at the present. Certainly it seems to me that the policy of that legislation should be carried out for a reasonable time until proper adjustments can be made not only of our citizens who are newcomers but of our over-all population and economic problems.

When we have made these adjustments, if we can, there will still be plenty of people who will want to come to America.

At the meeting of leaders in the field of agriculture, labor, health, welfare, and education, called by Commissioner Linder, the problem of United States immigration policy was thoroughly discussed. The following statement presents the points revealed in the discussion.

1. Immigration is a national rather than a State problem and should be considered under this aspect. The State of Georgia is not in the main stream of immigration, and even under a very liberal immigration act it would receive only a small number of immigrants. (Recent experience has shown that most of the newcomers to the State have been effectively absorbed. The experiences with the recent displaced-persons program with regard to community acceptance of the newcomers are good examples.)

2. Apart from the humanitarian and other considerations, an objective appraisal of the economic development and future welfare of the Nation must be the basis of our national immigration policy. The group felt that a return to the type of mass immigration that prevailed up to the First World War is neither feasible nor desirable and can only aggravate our domestic problem.

3. We recognize that our present position of world leadership imposes upon the United States an obligation toward other nations with regard to immigration which we cannot shirk altogether without creating doubt in our right to exert moral as well as military, political, and economic leadership.

4. With regard to the amount of desirable immigration, the opinion of the group varied. Some thought it advisable to have a temporary halt in immigration to give the country time to adjust itself to the great increase in labor productivity. There was a minority who believed that the American economy will continue to grow at the same rate as before and that there will be not only a place for them but also a need for more immigration than is provided for in the current legislation. The inflow of new people is needed to assure that new ideas and new skills will be available in the future as they have been in the past. The group generally agreed that at present a limited amount of immigration is not harmful and that it can be beneficial provided the type of immigrants to be admitted is geared to the economic and social needs of the Nation.

5. We consider it essential that the immigrants should come into typical American environment and accept American concepts of government, and should not form new clusters of foreign-born people. The older agglomerations of foreign-born people have rapidly become Americanized as second and third generations replace the original immigrants. In providing for more liberal immigration legislation, this problem of proper resettlement should be kept in mind. The group, however, was unanimous in that proper screening should be applied in order to select only those of particular profession or skill when needed to keep out subversive elements without impairing the flow of bona fide immigration.

6. In view of the rapid and almost revolutionary decline in the farm population and the movement of large numbers of farm workers to industrial centers, there seems to be no sense in admitting immigrant farm workers who will soon drift into the cities the same way as native-born farm workers, but there appears to be room for qualified European immigrants when properly screened who want to become independent farmers of the type and caliber of the Pennsylvania Dutch and similar groups who have made an outstanding record in the Southeast as well as in other parts of the country. There is also room for workers with skills that are in rare supply, for independent craftsmen, and for professional people with good training, in short, for quality immigration.

7. With regard to the long-range effects of immigration, group opinion was divided. Some felt that we are presently producing more than we can consume and that we shall find it increasingly hard to give jobs to all the people who need them, so that any large-scale admission of immigrants would in the long run result in the displacement of the native-born workers. There were those who believe that in the future as in the past, every wave of immigrants will result in a further rapid rise of the standard of living, since the newcomers will contribute to the development of new types of economic activity and thereby help increase the number of available jobs. These members feel that we have nothing to fear in the future other than an attitude of resignation that would make it hard for us to make full use of the opportunities which the future offers to native-born and newcomers alike.

It was the consensus of opinion that an "open door policy" or even the laxity that has been practiced in recent years would not only be inadvisable, but very likely detrimental to the future welfare of the

Nation. Our forefathers builded a great Nation, carved it from the wilderness with the aid of unlimited natural resources, suffered untold hardships with hostile enemy at home and abroad. Our independence was won, and in order to survive we were forced to do battle on the high seas and more recently on foreign soil. We, the sons, would not be true to the tradition of our forefathers should we fail to protect and safeguard the future of the Nation. Our Nation may be standing at the crossroads as the world seems to be on the march with so little stability except by force and fear; therefore, it is our firm conviction that we should proceed with caution.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Holton.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Holton, if I understand this correctly, this statement which you have read includes three aspects; it includes commissioner of agriculture Mr. Linder's statement, a general point of view of those present at the meeting, and then your own consensus?

Mr. HOLTON. That last paragraph was my own conclusion.

Mr. ROSENFELD. A conclusion of the consensus?

Mr. HOLTON. I tried to base it on the general opinion of those who were there.

Mr. ROSENFELD. You have had a good deal of experience as a responsible officer in connection with the Georgia Displaced Persons Commission. I wonder if your judgment, and that of Mr. Linder, agrees with this general observation contained in point 1 of the statement from which you read, and which was presented at the meeting called by Mr. Linder, which I quote: "Recent experience has shown that most of the newcomers to the State have been effectively absorbed. The experience with the recent Displaced Persons Programs with regard to community acceptance of the newcomers are good examples"; does that to your experience?

Mr. HOLTON. I cannot speak for Mr. Linder, but I can speak for myself as secretary of the Georgia Displaced Persons Committee. My experience has been that they were absorbed but not on the farm where many of them were originally sent, because we have innumerable cases. Incidentally, Commissioner Linder in a little publication that we issued called the Georgia Market Bulletin, put a little notice in last week about this hearing, and wanted to know the opinion of the people in general who had had some experience with these displaced persons. Up until this morning—there are some 40 letters in this batch. We received some 25 of them this morning. That publication was mailed only last Wednesday. And most of these—I glanced through them rather hurriedly—are telling the sad experience that they had on the farm, and as far as I know at the present time, not a single farmer that I know of has been different. Now there may be some here in Georgia, as Dr. Sebba announced this morning, as the Director of the survey of the displaced persons program of Georgia, which he is conducting. But as far as I know at the present time, I do not know a single farmer that has stayed on the original farm. Now we have moved a few of them and at the present time they are still sticking with the second man. But I do not know of a single one, but there may be some.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. ROSENFELD. In part. Then are they following the general pattern that you have spoken of, of people moving from the farms elsewhere?



Mr. HOLTON. That is right.

Mr. ROSENFELD. In other words, is it not that they are unique but they are following the pattern of Georgia and the South in general, of moving out of the farms to the cities?

Mr. HOLTON. Except a little bit more rapid about it.

Mr. ROSENFELD. They are more rapid?

Mr. HOLTON. Yes.

Mr. ROSENFELD. I would like to refer to another conclusion, contained in point 4 of the prepared statement you read, where the group whose names you have furnished the Commission said the following: "The inflow of new people is needed to assure that new ideas and new skills will be available in the future as they have been in the past. The group generally agreed that at present a limited amount of immigration is not harmful and that it can be beneficial provided the type of immigrants to be admitted is geared to the economic and social needs of the nation."

As a distinguished public official of this State, would you be able to give the Commission your judgment on that general statement?

Mr. HOLTON. No, I don't think so. Let me refer to there where it says "The group generally agreed"—that particular question, Mr. Chairman, was not put to a vote; but there were several there that spoke favorably on that point.

Mr. ROSENFELD. And do you find any difficulty with that as something this Commission ought to bear in mind?

Mr. HOLTON. I don't think so. I think though if you will pardon me, that it is more a reference to industrial labor than agricultural—the D. P.'s in general.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Well, that was the second point, another point about which I wished to ask you. Later on in point 6 of the prepared statement they refer to exactly the point you have referred to, stating: "There appears to be room for qualified European immigrants when properly screened who want to become independent farmers. \* \* \*"

Mr. HOLTON. I think we can agree on that.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Is there a shortage of farm labor in the State of Georgia?

Mr. HOLTON. In a general sense, no. Of course we do bring in some surplus labor during the harvest season. We brought in a few I understand, 400 or 500 Mexicans this year, to one county down here, to help pick cotton, but that is temporary. Of course, you can't just go and get farm labor like you could a few years ago. But I think in most sections there is an available supply of labor. That is due largely to the fact that Georgia, together with most of the Southern States, is glad to and is gradually going from a row crop system to a broad agricultural program which involves livestock, more pastures, and other crops like pastures and hay.

Mr. ROSENFELD. As this movement from the one crop economy becomes more widespread, will you need more people then?

Mr. HOLTON. No, we will need less people.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Less people—would that be true?

Mr. HOLTON. Yes, that seems to be true. This statement that you have referred to here—"We do feel, still, that with the amount of land that we have in Georgia"—now you will notice that is pretty well safeguarded there. It states the type of citizen that came in

during that time, those are the people that are interested in agriculture.

Mr. ROSENFELD. You mean you want real farmers?

Mr. HOLTON. We had in mind the type of people that helped settle the Northwest, particularly Minnesota and the Dakotas, that type of farmer who is really a farmer. We probably have room in Georgia for good dairymen, and probably some other farm people of that type who are interested in farmers, who are farmers because of their training and background and experience, but not people who just have come over here and classify themselves as farmers, and within 6 months they have gone to New Jersey or somewhere.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Supposing you do get farmers of the kind you want, where do you think there would be need for them; you say in the dairy farms, where else, if any, do you need them?

Mr. HOLTON. The livestock people probably could use more—we probably could use more in our livestock department. Now we have here today one of our best farmers in the State who probably could answer that question much better than I.

Mr. ROSENFELD. In the room?

Mr. HOLTON. Yes, sir, he is in the room.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is that?

Mr. HOLTON. Mr. T. R. Breedlove back there is one of our best farmers.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Perhaps he would be willing to testify before the Commission?

Mr. BREEDLOVE (from audience). I might. Yes.

Mr. ROSENFELD. May I ask one question further of Mr. Holton before Mr. Breedlove testifies? I take it from what you read under point 6 of your prepared statement, which was that there is also room for workers with skills that are in rare supply, for independent craftsmen, and for professional people with good training, in short, for quality immigration that there is no difficulty about that conclusion.

Mr. HOLTON. Of course that statement there was prepared largely by Dr. Sebba, and Father Donovan, and I think it was read probably by Dean Gates of the University of Georgia, but that was their opinion and of course we did not take issue with them, because we simply did not have the facts.

Commissioner O'GRADY. This morning we heard some testimony about the lack of skilled workers in the smaller towns like tailors, plumbers, and barbers and a number of such other skills. Are you familiar with that situation?

Mr. HOLTON. Now on some of this, frankly I do not know, because my field is agriculture and I do not know about those things. I am not in a position to know.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Holton, I wanted to ask you this: Did you find that some of these DP's who claimed to be farmers weren't really farmers at all?

Mr. HOLTON. Yes, we have considerable evidence to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. Then are you suggesting here that, if there is any more immigration, that the screening should be more careful and more adequate and more effective than it was before?

Mr. HOLTON. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. Let me say this, too: that along some year and a half ago, the United States Displaced Persons Commission asked the United States Department of Agricul-

ture to loan them about five or six county agents, and we feel in our own mind that the quality of so-called farmers that we got after these county agents went over to Europe and began to screen these people was much higher, men more in accordance with what they represented themselves to be, than probably before. So we would highly recommend that these people be highly screened. I am speaking largely now from an agricultural standard, because that's my field.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course. We have heard this in other States, too; that while they had no criticism to make of the type of people, and of their ability to assimilate in the Nation, yet they didn't assimilate in the particular field in which they claimed to have experience.

In other words, some of them got in on the theory that they were farmers when actually they were found not to be farmers. I guess the experience in that has been the same in Georgia as it has been elsewhere, in that respect.

Mr. HOLTON. I can give you one example that was reported to us by a letter a few days ago by two different people; one was a farmer and the other was a merchant in a nearby country town, not over 100 miles from here, where the DP that came in was supposed to have been a farmer, and of course he was sponsored by a farmer; but it appears that when he got to this farm he knew practically nothing about farming, and it developed within a few months that he was not a farmer but a veterinarian, and he finally got over to the University of Georgia and took a refresher course for about 3 months and I understand he is with the Sanitary Board of the State of North Dakota at the present time, but he came in as a farmer, so the sponsor reported to us, and he was supposed to have been a farmer. Well, he wasn't interested in farming apparently, but he is a veterinarian, of course.

Mr. ROSENFELD. It is true, Mr. Holton, that most of these people were chosen for the sponsors by the religious agent or religious agencies which the sponsors themselves designated to select the DP's.

Mr. HOLTON. That's unfortunately true.

Mr. ROSENFELD. So most of these people that were selected were chosen at first by people designated by the sponsors to do the choosing, and it wasn't as you say, until this other technique was instituted that there was some device for checking on it.

Mr. HOLTON. That's true, absolutely.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Breedlove—whom Mr. Holton has mentioned—is one of those who was originally invited to appear, but we were unable to communicate with him more recently; and he has now indicated he will be willing to testify.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Breedlove, you may testify, if you will.

### STATEMENT OF T. R. BREEDLOVE

Mr. BREEDLOVE. I am T. R. Breedlove, a farmer, of Monroe, Ga.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Breedlove, you heard the testimony or the statement made by Mr. Holton, and he suggested you might be able to advise the Commission as to whether or not there is a need for labor on the farms in this State.

Mr. BREEDLOVE. First, I would like to make a little explanation of just why I am here, and that is on the invitation of Mr. Rosenfield, your executive director, and through our assistant secretary of agriculture.

I serve, in addition to being a farmer, I serve as chairman of the State agricultural and State production and marketing administration committee, a committee composed of five farmers appointed by the secretary of agriculture. But I would like to just speak as a farmer of Walton County, Monroe, Ga.

With reference to there being a need for a farm laborer, we could use some trained or skilled farm labor. We have an ample supply, in my honest opinion, of the kind of labor that we have on the farm. I would like to emphasize the fact that, as Mr. Holton mentioned to you, we are changing our system of farming, in that we are not growing the row crops that we formerly grew, but are going more for livestock, both dairying and hogs and beef cattle. It will take less labor but more skill.

I would like to say, first, that in connection with your legislation, which, as I understand the law—your McCarran-Walter bill, which is now law—to me, it is an answer to a problem that has grown on us in our country over many, many years. Suddenly, we, in agriculture, do not use labor as we had even 10 years ago, but we are using mechanical equipment to farm with and in producing entirely different crops, and harvesting them in a different way. When we think of the population increase in this country today, with the population going down and down continuously on the farm, yet with the increase in population of more than 2,000,000 people a year of our own Nation, I feel we have a very definite responsibility to improve the conditions of our own people—to help build the standard of living there. And if we are going to have any immigration from other countries, certainly they should be screened, and screened more carefully than ever before, because I think we have the leadership and the know-how in this Nation, so far as agriculture is concerned, and I would not attempt to speak for even agriculture, or any other phase of our economy; but we have the know-how in our own land to grow the food and for not only this country of ours but to help those friendly to us. And without thinking of opening the doors for immigrants to continue to increase in numbers into our country, I feel definitely that they should be closed as this bill provides, screened more carefully, and that to help our friendly countries throughout the world that our point 4 program is the way to help them, because certainly we can go into their countries and help them better than we can attempt to bring a few individuals and farmers and families here to rehabilitate them here in our land.

I certainly hope that this kind of legislation will stand.

THE CHAIRMAN. Well, you know that under the new act, Mr. Breedlove, there are provisions for the admission of approximately 154,000 people a year, and the question has been raised with us as we traveled around the country, as to whether the quota system set forth in the act is the proper way to admit those who can qualify. Have you any views on that or not?

MR. BREEDLOVE. I would just say this in connection with a quota system: I think certainly that is a question of national scope, and one in which certainly we should be sure that, whether it be 54,000 or 154,000 would not matter so much, but it is the quality which we are going to get, in whatever number that are allowed to come into our country. Certainly, we can, I am sure, use new blood, but certainly we want to be sure that it is the right kind, and that it is going to

serve in the place which it comes to our country to serve, and certainly I think your quota system might be looked at very, very carefully between countries, between nations, and I would not be competent to say how it should be changed.

But I think definitely you have got to have some plan, and, of course, I know of no better way than to set some kind of a quota.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the quota system should be based on a national origins formula, according to the census of 1920?

Mr. BREEDLOVE. I would say so far as race, color, religion, or creed. I would certainly not consider anything other than the qualifications to meet the standards of whatever they were brought into this country for.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, are you saying that you think that first you have to ascertain what are the needs of the United States, and then you get human beings to fit those qualifications?

Mr. BREEDLOVE. Definitely so.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have health, security standards, and all other essential kinds of standards?

Mr. BREEDLOVE. All kinds of standards, on what our needs are, and then fit the people to what our needs are.

The CHAIRMAN. Irrespective of others?

Mr. BREEDLOVE. Irrespective. I have got no feeling that we should be discriminatory at all in that field.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Breedlove.

Mr. BREEDLOVE. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Holton, I understand you have a summary that might be of some help to us in the record.

Mr. HOLTON. No, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the summary yet. I just asked Mr. Shirk if it would be permissible for me to submit a summary, a kind of résumé. I have quite a file of letters, some bad and not so good.

The CHAIRMAN. That's all right. We would like to have whatever information you have.

Mr. HOLTON. Fine; I would be glad to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. You will send it on to us in Washington?

Mr. HOLTON. That's right; just for your information.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. The record will be kept open at this point for the insertion of that summary when it is received.

(The summary follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
State Capitol,  
Atlanta 3, Ga., November 7, 1952.

HON. PHILIP P. PERLMAN,  
*Chairman, President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PERLMAN: In accordance with understanding of agreement made at the hearing in Atlanta, Ga., October 17, I am submitting a supplementary statement in regard to the operation of the displaced persons program in Georgia. You will find a résumé of letters received by me during the past few weeks.

Dr. James H. Little, 5341 First Street, Tucker, Ga.: Has 60 acres of land, 15 registered Hereford cattle, hogs and chickens, with five-room concrete block cottage with all conveniences, Norge refrigerator, electric range, washing machine, which had rented for \$65 a month. Received DP Jan Cytrinoicz, wife and two children from Brunswick, Germany. Nationality, Lithuanians. Purchased \$300 milk cow, paid them \$100 month cash, half milk and butter and eggs produced on farm, to act as caretaker, rent and all conveniences free. Their obsession was to own an automobile. Began immediate correspondence with Lithuanian colony, Chicago. They made no bones about their dislike for

America and Americans. Man had an annoying habit of beating his wife on Sunday. "I interceded and made him stop beating his wife and using profane language." The following day he departed for Chicago without warning. Utterances insulting and seditious. "As far as the DP problems are concerned, the Americans are pure damn fools—not excluding yours truly."

Erick Dederscheck, route No. 1, Millen, Ga.: Arrived United States 1930, worked on farm in Illinois 3 years, moved to Jenkins County, Ga., 1933. Upon insistence of sister in Germany, got Mr. Sid Newton, with aid of Congressman Preston, to sponsor brother-in-law and family. The people of the local Baptist church and Jenkins County provided all necessities to start them housekeeping. Mr. Newton paid the man \$25 per week rain or shine. Brother-in-law's name is Berthold Beolow. He lived on Polish border. He was going to be court-martialed by the German Army for destroying Army property, but the French took him prisoner. Dederscheck says that after he returned, following his release by the French, he stole farmers' potatoes and chickens and anything he could find. The DP repaid Mr. Newton for railroad fare from New Orleans. Dederscheck paid \$75 for furniture, \$20 to lawyer on bill of \$250. DP bought \$200 ice box, paid \$70. Dederscheck says, "We want these people sent back to Germany. They are no good to us; not any DP is good."

B. L. Helton, Jr., route No. 1, Worthen, Ga.: Employed DP with wife and 3-year-old baby March 1952, for general farm work. Attitude at first very good, later had to check his work behind him. Neighbors assisted in setting up housekeeping. Left for Michigan, August 1952. The DP said they were told before leaving Germany they would get \$1.25 per hour to begin work with, and farming cannot stand that kind of price for unskilled labor. Learned from DP that it was prearranged before leaving Germany with friends in United States to accept any kind of offer to come to this country. "Personally I feel that the Government does not realize what a grave mistake it may be making. Displaced persons will promise anything to get into this country." Practically all that I know. They are moving back to the congested areas in Michigan and New York. This is only one of the many families that have come into Washington County and left for greener pastures.

F. A. Bailey, 130 King Street, Charleston, S. C.: Have been closely connected with this work through Lutheran Council and in position to know what has happened to several cases brought in for the past 2 years. "In every instance the average person that was sponsored stayed from 1 week to 3 months and some the maximum of 1 year." I sponsored an Estonian family—man, wife, two children, giving them use of five-room cottage on plantation, completely furnished, lights and everything on the farm that was required for food. Farm modern with modern equipment. They had practically nothing to buy except coffee and sugar. After 1 year, in middle of crop season 1951, he told me that he was leaving within 2 weeks if I didn't raise his salary from \$80 to \$100 a month, including everything that I mentioned above that I furnished him without cost. He remained on another year and in May 1952, he issued an ultimatum that he was leaving for St. Louis within 2 weeks regardless. He had saved better than \$1,000, but said he could get \$2 an hour in St. Louis as a brick mason. I travel through South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and find that everybody has had the same experience. Why continue to kid ourselves as these people do not add to our way of life and in every instance, 90 percent of them do not become naturalized citizens. I would like to complete this letter with the following remark: "Just how stupid can we Americans continue to be?"

Thomas H. Carter, Johns Island, S. C.: Sponsored a college-educated Latvian, wife, and daughter. Paid railroad fare from New York to Charleston, without cost to them. The man was a splendid worker, but his wife was most disagreeable. The daughter had a sunny disposition and made splendid grades at school. They remained 11 months and joined a colony in Grand Rapids, Mich. The DP idea was good but they played the Americans badly for a bunch of suckers.

An Admirer, Atlanta, Ga.: No personal experience with DP's, but read about several hundred that were brought to Louisiana farms and after several weeks of new life in this country they rebelled and said they had rather be returned to Poland, as they could not subsist on the food, and the pay they were receiving was inadequate. Catholic priest sent them North to industrial centers. One Jew DP making good in jewelry business in Macon, Ga. Rich's in Atlanta employing Jews.

Otis A. Chandler, Social Circle, Ga.: German family of six arrived May 1952, worked on dairy farm at small salary and poor living quarters. DP and sponsor

could not work together satisfactorily. Paid sponsor in full and moved to Farrell, Pa., September 1952.

C. W. Hodgson, 700 Conway Road N.W., Atlanta, Ga.: June 1952, Johann Tamassy and wife moved from Oklahoma City to my residence. They were from Hungary and have been in the United States about 1 year, holding several jobs in Oklahoma. Mr. Tamassy spoke no English, little German, native speech Magyar. Her attitude bad. "They stated that the only reason that they came to America was because they understood they could get old-age pensions and other benefits." Now employed at Shorter College, Rome, Ga. "Frankly, our experience with these people was most discouraging, and it is a little difficult for me to understand why our Government would permit people of this class to come into this country merely to enjoy the benefits without producing work of their own."

Mrs. J. O. M. Smith, Route 4, Commerce, Ga., operator of Pedigreed Seed Farm: Through Southern Baptist Convention, secured Helena Dietericks, Russian woman, age 57, February 20, 1952. Worked as housekeeper and treated as a member of the family in a home with all modern facilities. "I have to look after my farm, or I would never have put in an application for her." "With typical Russian cunning, she merely used me as a stepping stone. I think she is a dumbbug and should be deported." Immediately upon arrival, she began to correspond with friends in New York, where her present address is 447 New Jersey Avenue, Brooklyn 7, N. Y.

E. J. Jones, 2080 North Side Drive N.W., Atlanta, Ga.: Met Latvian Minister in Atlanta, March 1949, and selected DP from photo, supposedly with farm background. Corresponded with DP, T. Dumpis, several times, explaining in detail type of work on my farm, Greene County, Ga. DP wrote me to sponsor his 65-year-old mother, brother, and sister. All arrived Thanksgiving Day 1949, except brother, who was refused admittance. After a day or two on farm, working conditions were never right with them, either too cold or some other reason. He put out report that they were not getting enough food, and the county agent came to my farm and was shown that they were fed as well as any member of my family. Two boys were put in public school. Vocational teacher arranged for them to move to another farm. I was finally paid in full for money advanced on travel, etc. DP later moved to Lexington, and Dr. Cavanaugh got him in the University of Georgia for a refresher course. It developed that he was a trained veterinarian and later moved to North Dakota. Other examples of unsatisfactory experience were given by Mr. Jones. "I say keep all of them out of our country. The good ones don't want to come over, and we don't want the sorry ones."

J. M. Howard, Howard Mercantile Co., Stephens, Ga.: Same DP as above. "I helped this man to attend the college at Athens for one quarter and hoped to get him a license to practice in Oglethorpe County; however, he was never able to get a permanent license. He was by far the best veterinarian I ever used; was very sorry he could not locate in Oglethorpe. At the present time, he is working for the State Livestock Board of North Dakota. He is a very high-type man, had a splendid family. The entire family would be an addition to any community. Working with this man, and what I know of the displaced people who have been brought to this section of Georgia, the first mistake the Government is making is bringing the intellect of Europe here and expecting them to become common laborers. These people have never done any manual labor, nor do they know how to work."

T. S. Oliver, Route 1, Jonesboro, Ga.: Lutheran Evangelicals came to Atlanta spring 1949 to find sponsors for DP's. "I went to see him and he told me if I would sponsor a family he would assure me they would stay with me at least a year. They arrived November 1949, two men, two women, and a 2-year-old child. I was immediately advised that they would not sign a contract as to length of service. Three and one-half months later the young woman joined relatives in Chicago. Her husband, father, and mother remained through the winter, with work that I had provided. They repaid me money advanced. The husband joined his wife in Chicago and the old couple moved to another farm and in less than 6 months they were in Chicago. "No displaced persons should be allowed to enter the United States to work on the farm unless they sign a contract for definite period."

Mrs. A. S. Varn, P. O. Box 1593, Savannah, Ga.: "I know Mr. and Mrs. Ed Pretorius, Statesboro, Ga., had most unsatisfactory dealings with the ones they had." "It is one of the most dangerous things the American people can do to let these millions of foreigners swamp our country, and so much faster than they can be assimilated, thus enabling their foreign ideologies to be trans-

planted and rooted in our Nation." They are, of course, an asset to the party that lets them enter the country, because for this favor they will help keep the party in power."

Ed L. Preetorius, P. O. Box 354, Statesboro, Ga.: Assigned a Polish family consisting of father, mother, two grown sons, and young daughter. Sponsored by local Catholic priest and were supposedly hand-picked for our particular needs. "More than 30 families were sent to this neighborhood. All were claimed to be farmers. It became obvious immediately that there was not a farmer in the lot." They knew nothing of farming methods and were largely textile workers. They were provided with a seven-room house furnished completely. They did the milking and were furnished 4 gallons of milk daily, wood, poultry, garden plot, and electricity free. We leaned over backward to give them every opportunity. Two children placed in school and jobs secured at local hospital for older daughter who had preceded them. Later joined by young man former friend of the family who later married the older daughter and a nice wedding, including reception, inviting all displaced families in the country, was given them, including refreshments, wedding cake, dance, etc. "We shared our clothes with them, our bed linen; we showed them how to can vegetables, raise their own chickens; gave them pigs to raise for themselves and sincerely believed they were happy and intended staying." At their request, we entered into tenant's contract on the farm. The father and mother "retired" as they were too old to work—40 and 50 years of age. The daughter and husband worked outside the farm at a salary. We were advised one morning the entire family was moving to Savannah immediately, where they had secured employment and living quarters. "My wife kept in touch with them even after they moved to Savannah and found that the welfare agencies were taking care of them most of the time." It seems the jobs were temporary and when the baby arrived welfare agencies had to take care of all expenses. That family moved to Holyoke, Mass., and later a letter was received from a "friend of the family" which was most insulting. All of the DP's have left Bulloch and Screven Counties and joined relatives elsewhere. Our family was the last to go and they stayed just long enough to get the sister and her husband here. They stayed only 5 days after the sister arrived.

Mrs. F. M. McCullough, 46 Beverly Road NE., Atlanta, Ga.: "I want to tell you about the Latvians I saw in Sledge, Miss., where I spent last winter. I suppose they came under the heading of 'displaced persons' or 'uprooted persons.' They were capable, intelligent, and made very desirable citizens. At Senatobia, another town about 20 miles from Sledge, there was such a colony of them; they had their own little church and pastor, and are Protestants. At Sledge there is a growing furniture factory, operated, I think, entirely by Latvians. I suppose there are many in Georgia of the same type. I just do not happen to know of them and am writing this that the idea may be conveyed, some displaced persons, and I dare say many will prove assets rather than liabilities to a community and I feel sure the women of displaced families long for homes to keep and something to be interested in."

Mrs. Benjamin A. Pollock, Terrell Mill Road, Route 3, Marietta, Ga.: Sponsored John Remmer and family through National Lutheran Council. Arrived February 1952. Children attending Marietta schools and can speak English fluently. Oldest boy advanced beyond his age. Oldest girl of 19 works in Pollock home and is said to be a fine, intelligent, industrious girl. The sponsor gave them a small home and milk cow. They have equipped this farm with chickens, hogs, and other livestock, all paid for and gradually repaying the Lutheran Council for money advanced for transportation. These are fine, industrious, and conscientious people and have not asked for one thing since arrival, except the money they earned for their work. They attend church at Marietta and make weekly contributions. "You would think the younger children had lived here all their lives, they are so well integrated into the American way of life." I consider the Remmers to be good citizens of this community. As soon as possible they will become naturalized. We pay them a salary they can live decently on.

T. J. McConnell, Cleveland, Ga.: Sponsored DP family, Paul Kalynowsky, through United Ukrainian Relief Organization, man, wife, and two children. Arrived October 10, 1949; left December 16, 1949. Through correspondence setting forth our requirements and upon information furnished by DP, this family was selected. The DP did not like the country and refused to try to communicate with sponsor. All communications were with his wife, and instead of being 44 years old, he was 57. He was supposed to know something about auto-engine repair work, but knew absolutely nothing about gas engines, woodworking, or anything of that nature. Finally put him to raking leaves and other odd jobs.



Through correspondence he had located 13 other DP's who had gathered at the insane asylum at Owings Mills, Md. "These men had been sponsored by farmers all over America just so that they could get into the country." "Some of them were on these farms less than a month." "They just used these farmers as dupes as they did me." The DP requested funds to go to Maryland, but the sponsor and the relief organization refused. They communicated with other DP's and received money by return mail.

"This showed me that the whole thing had been organized while still in the camps in Europe." "He falsified his statement to enter the country." "On his own statement he had been an officer in the Russian Army. Mr. McConnell reports that he has not received one penny in repayment for the expense that was incurred in bringing this family to his farm and for keeping them during the short time they remained with him. The matter has been taken up with the Ukrainian Relief Organization without result. He also states that he has asked Congressman Wood to start necessary proceedings to have this man deported, as he has violated his oath of entry, falsified statements, and entered by fraud. The DP's present address is 112 Jackson Place, Baltimore 31, Md.

G. W. Pirkle, Route 1, Sycamore, Ga.: Sponsored A. A. Janson and family, Latvians; arrived October 1949 from a German DP camp. June 1951, they moved to South Carolina. They were requested to stay on the farm until crops could be harvested, but they stated they were hunting bigger jobs with more pay. Janson said when he moved that he didn't care for principle; it was dollars and cents that he was after. Mr. Pirkle assisted his brother-in-law, W. C. Compton, in sponsoring a German family of five named Hoffman through the Southern Baptist DP Office, New Orleans, La., that remained 6 weeks, arriving in May 1952 and leaving in June for California.

Foster W. Bolin, Shellman, Ga.: Early part of 1949 sponsored DP Adolpe Baginsky through Church World Service. Arrived August 1950, and the first 2 or 3 weeks "exceeding my fondest expectations." In few weeks began to receive foreign-language newspaper from Cleveland, Ohio. "It soon became very evident that he had intended to use the farm only as a stepping stone to gain entrance into the United States." "In an effort to encourage him to remain as a farm worker, I offered to give him the necessary assistance to purchase a farm in 2 or 3 years. He then told me that he was wasting his time on the farm." Colonel Molner, Cuthbert attorney on active duty at Pentagon Building, Washington, conversed with the DP and suggested that I contact Senator Russell and ask that he be deported. I was convinced he was unworthy of America. "I could mention other instances, but it will suffice to say that in my opinion America has not been helped by the entry into this country of the vast majority of these displaced persons."

A. R. Hicks, president, Soque Club, Inc., route No. 1, box 96, Atlanta, a club of Atlanta citizens own considerable acreage in the mountains of north Georgia, where they maintain a social club, and for more than a year Mr. Hicks has made a desperate effort to locate two DP families to look after this property. Two families assigned him, arrived at different times, and after being fully informed of conditions, surroundings, etc., they accepted, but one remained only a few days and the other moved within less than a month, both going to other locations in Georgia.

H. G. Walton, 2006 Warlick Place, NE., Atlanta, Ga. Three displaced families were placed on farms in Butts County, Ga., at an expenditure of \$5,000 "proved to be the worst people God ever made. Without any notice left over night for Grand Rapids, Mich."

Mr. J. T. Holloway, 710 Bonaventure Road, Savannah, Ga. A young Bulgarian lived in this home for 8 months. He was in Germany studying pharmacy at the outbreak of the war and not allowed to return home and at the close of the war unsafe to return. His sister, who was studying English in an Austrian college at the time of the outbreak of war, married an American officer in 1946. They arranged for the young man to come to America. "After working on a farm while he studied English, he secured a position in a drug store and boarded at my home. He was very ambitious and a fine, honest, well educated young man." He is now with his sister in Detroit and his brother-in-law. The American officer holds a degree in agricultural engineering and has a good position with International Harvester Co. "I spent 3 months this summer in Texas and Washington States where I came in contact with several displaced persons who were fine persons and seemed very grateful for an opportunity to live and work in this country."

Rev. James R. Smith, pastor, Graystone Presbyterian Church, Blount Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.

The church sponsored two families, Katchie Szathmary and wife, and Col. Jenó Matefy and wife, parents of Mrs. Szathmary. Although a colonel in the Hungarian Army, Mr. Matefy took a janitor's job. After a year and 4 months he died and the entire city mourned his passing. Many people contributed to care, preparation, and burial. "These are all wonderful people. Simple, hard working, cultural, trustworthy, grateful and gentle people in every way wonderful citizens." The younger man, Mr. Szathmary, is an accountant by profession.

"You will hear, I am sure, of many families that did not work out well. I know of one here that their former sponsor abused until the community took them away from him. I know too that at one time only farm folk were being admitted and many to get out of Europe before Stalin broke in on them, claimed to be farmers and were not and were misfits in this country until they were moved. We do not think of these peoples as displaced persons any more, but as delayed pilgrims. There must be a proper percentage of bad ones, but we have not found them among those that have come into our care yet.

"This church has issued a special bulletin giving the life story of these people, history of their country, and a short description of their experiences during the war period and afterward."

107 West Walnut Street, Montpelier, Ohio, (name withheld by request), a farmer living near Michigan line reported of a neighbor that had brought in three DP families. "He said the Government was taking these farmers' boys for the Army and bringing in these people, most of them with families of six or eight people, and sometimes two or three boys of military age." This man was told by neighbors this had to be stopped or they would handle him accordingly. "My husband says they are going to kill off all the American boys and fill up the country with misplaced persons. They bring them in and they can no doubt get on relief as soon as they get in the country and then if they work a month or two, or the required time, they can get unemployment compensation. The first atomic bomb should be dropped on United Nations. I never have believed in having someone else run our country for us. We are scattering our substance to the four winds and making a bunch of parasites of all the people we are helping. I think it is nothing more than a Communist plot to keep the war going, kill off all our men, and fill this country with aliens. And, the dumb clucks down in Washington are most of me-too boys. They are a bunch of suckers and grab the bait and fall for all this Marshall plan stuff. I think of the blood that has been spilled by Americans to make this country free, and how it is going to the dogs since the advent of the New Deal. Our own Government is helping to demoralize our youth. But, of course, that is the way the Communist expect to take over. Hitler did the same thing with his youth camps and advocated free love."

V. S. Crippen, county agricultural agent, Liberal, Kans.; Ernest Lee, Fowler, Kans., sponsored E. Kopmanus, Latvians, through the Friends Church. The man was supposed to have been a farmer, but he is a processor of fruits and as soon as his year was up, he secured employment in Wichita. His wife learned to run a tractor and refurnish every summer to the farm of Ernest Lee, their sponsor, to help during the harvest season. Mr. Lee also sponsored Mrs. Kaymannus' parents and found employment for them in a packing house in Wichita.

J. Herman Salley, Liberal, Kans., sponsored Bruno Silzars and family through Friends Church. Bruno's records show that he was a graduate in architecture and building inspector for the city of Riga, Latvia. He came over as a carpenter and followed that profession with Mr. Salley until he repaid all expenses involved. He now has a good position with the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. as a draftsman. He is an artist, winning second and third prizes with exhibits at the State fair. He recently addressed the American Association of University Women telling of his experiences in Latvia under the communistic regime. He took a course in citizenship at the University of Kansas and will become a naturalized citizen.

Mrs. Chester A. Burge, 1011 Nottingham Drive, Macon, Ga., son and husband in Europe 3 months 1951, and submitted application through the local Lutheran minister for the family of DPs.

Mr. Burge visited Frankfort, Germany, to interview a DP family personally. They were told when interviewed they would be given \$140 per month salary, furnished an apartment that had OPA ceiling at \$90 per month, with all utilities and if they remained in their employ they would be given \$10,000 at the death of the last survivor, either Mr. or Mrs. Burge, and a comfortable home comparable to their situation in life. Soon after arriving, they were taken to law firm of Turpin and Lane and they prepared a contract in accordance with the above, which was witnessed by Dr. Oleson of Mercer University. The DP

family was taken to Atlanta and outfitted with uniforms in the amount of \$225 at Rich's. They were not happy from the day of arrival and from time to time had created confusion and dissension. They complained about the climate and other things. After being there 3 months, they wanted to buy an automobile, but had not paid a dime for clothing, etc. that has been purchased for them. Mr. Burge purchased the automobile for them. This family remained 10 months and upon leaving demanded title to the car. When advised there was a mortgage on the car and uniforms purchased in Atlanta, complained to the Lutheran minister, who advised they must meet their obligations and within a short time they submitted a cashier's check for both the car and other obligations. The Lutheran minister requested Mr. Burge to sponsor a doctor and his wife. Employment was secured for him in the office of Sam Chandler Insurance Co., and the man remained 3 weeks. Both he and his wife complained of the heat, bad quarters, and left for Philadelphia, Pa. The first family moved to Chelsea, Mass. The salary of \$140 was for both man and wife, she being maid in the home and he a butler, chauffeur combination.

NOTE.—All correspondence in connection with this case that was exchanged between the sponsor and the DP's during the many months passed between the time of the interview and arrival in this country was submitted and has been examined carefully.

Helen Courtois, Keep America Committee, P. O. Box 3094, Terminal Annex, Los Angeles, Calif.: "We hope you will be on the spot and use most of their time to foil the dirty plot of Truman to fail to execute that fine McCarran bill that will save us from the influx of hundreds of thousands of the scum of Europe and Asia. Most of the highly trained Bolsheviks, the Jews, being now evicted from Russia, it is planned to have here for their take over. We must foil that plot. Please do your bit Friday. The McCarran Act will make it possible to hold back the flood if our people are alerted and act fast.

Robert Stocks, Garden Plain, Kans., sponsored a DP from Munich, Germany. The man was a trained agricultural specialist and his wife a doctor. They said they hoped sponsor would not meet them as they knew Russian friends in New York who would send for them. After week or more they refused to work. Friend signed up for another family of five, but the DP's refused his proposition. However, he received wire to send \$200 to New Orleans. The doctor couple said they were real farmers. Mr. Stocks took them, sent children to school. They occupied cabin completely furnished. Four months 1 day Russian friend in New York sent first couple tickets and they escaped to New York State. They took property valued at \$300.00. We bought children clothes, but not even thanked for it. They would not cooperate. The last couple moved to Detroit after sponsor gave them \$50. His total loss was about \$450, with no returns.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) TOM LINDER,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

Enclosure.

The following is quoted from a letter received from Dr. M. D. Collins, State superintendent of schools, State department of education, Atlanta, Ga., October 15, 1952:

"DEAR MR. LINDER: Yes, I agree with your point of view about having a conference relative to this important immigration matter. The Junior Order United American Mechanics is taking a definite position on this question and believes heartily in restricted immigration. I am enclosing to you a memorandum which has been prepared for another meeting by our attorney."

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Miller here?

# STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER F. MILLER, SOUTHERN DIRECTOR, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

MR. MILLER. I am Alexander F. Miller, 11 Pryor Street, Atlanta. I am southern director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which covers the region from Virginia through Texas.

I have a prepared statement I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mr. MILLER. B'nai B'rith is America's oldest civic organization of American Jews. It represents a membership of 300,000 men and women and their families.

The Anti-Defamation League is the educational arm of B'nai B'rith.

It is a creative organization seeking to build in the lives of all Americans those basic attitudes on which good human relations are founded.

It is an action organization acting for the continual expansion of democratic horizons.

I am grateful for this opportunity to express my views with reference to our immigration and naturalization laws. We believe it is healthy and significant that from time to time we examine objectively our procedures, our policies and our laws, to determine whether they are consonant with the democratic patterns established so wisely by our forefathers.

It is our belief that the current immigration and naturalization laws are at variance with the democratic process. We believe that our immigration policies are a paradox which not only tend to undermine our international and domestic situation, but are also an affront to our morality and to our ethics.

The several reasons for our opposition to the current immigration and naturalization policies have been rehearsed before this Commission many times. It is my intention today to list these reasons but briefly in order to give background and perspective for the specific testimony I shall attempt to offer with regard to the southern scene.

The three main features of our present immigration laws are: (A) The principle that persons who may be harmful to our country, such as criminals, subversives, diseased, are absolutely excluded; (B) the principle of limitation of the number of immigrants permitted to enter the United States in any year; and (C) the system of racial and national exclusion and preferences by which quotas are assigned to some lands and denied to others.

As to the first of these principles, the right to exclude undesirables, we think that it has the solidest support of American public opinion. Americans quite properly insist that immigrants be good human material.

The second of these principles, the idea of a numerical limitation upon the total volume of immigration in the United States, was an outgrowth of the isolationist thinking of the early twenties. During the past quarter of a century that attitude of necessity has been profoundly modified. Not only have opinions changed on the whole problem of isolationism, but more specifically that part of the American public that has given serious thought to immigration problems has begun to doubt the value of any blanket numerical limitation upon immigration. The time is close at hand when reconsideration of the principle of total limitations will be in order.

The third principle of our immigration laws, the principle of racial and national exclusions and preferences, has been repudiated by every decent American. The principle of racial preference came to be recognized after 1933 as Hitlerism. It is diametrically opposed to our Declaration of Independence, which proclaims that all men are created equal. Even the McCarran-Walter Act, which has been sharply criticized by many groups throughout the country for its restrictive and

backward looking features, gives grudging acceptance to the public wish to rid our immigration policies of racism. Indeed, it was to a large extent on the basis of the provisions eliminating the bar against the immigration and naturalization of Asiatics that Senator McCarran made his appeal for support of the bill.

As Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, pointed out recently, "There are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind and character. The doctrine of racial superiority was used by the Nazis and Fascists as a cover for their vicious deeds in the last World War. Racial conceits and pretensions have frequently been used by the forces of privilege, darkness, and reaction.

To remedy the defects in our immigration policies the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, acting together with the American Jewish Committee, has outlined a four-point program.

1. The establishment by law of a National Immigration Policy Commission whose members would be partly selected from the Senate and the House and partly appointed by the President. This Commission would set the maximum number of immigrants to be admitted to this country each calendar year. In so doing, the Commission would be required by law to set a number no lower than 300,000 or 0.2 percent (two-tenths of 1 percent) of our total population. The criteria for the number of immigrants admitted each year should be determined by:

- (a) The demand for immigration visas in each country by qualified bona fide applicants for immigration registered at our consulate in that country.

- (b) The extent of our economic and military commitments in the various countries.

- (c) The impact of a particular quota on the implementation of our foreign policy. I think this is an extension of the arguments advanced by the last two witnesses.

- (d) The relationship of immigration from a particular country to our domestic and economic needs.

2. The establishment of a Visa Review Board to which persons denied visas by an American consul may appeal. We believe that it is contrary to the basic principles of democracy to allow any subordinate official of the United States to have unlimited power over other persons, subject to no review.

3. The revision of deportation laws so that only those situations should be declared grounds for deportation where the interest of the United States clearly requires deportation. Deportation has long been recognized as a drastic punishment which may be tantamount to imprisonment or death and which therefore should be used with circumspection and with due regard to the interest of all individuals involved. If it were not so late I would like to tell the Commission the story of a brilliant young man who came to my house night before last and told me that after having second-class citizenship under the Nazis and the Communists he now is a naturalized citizen of this country and feels the same sword of Damocles hanging over his head as he had under those regimes.

4. The elimination of all disabilities suffered by naturalized citizens because they are not native-born. Naturalized citizens now suffer many inequities from which our citizens by birth are free. There

have actually been established two classes of citizenship. The very existence of classes and levels of citizenship is a detriment to democracy.

One aspect of our immigration laws which has run counter to the general policy in force since 1924 has been the special legislation which has permitted the immigration of displaced persons during the post-war era. I believe that an examination of the effect of the influx of these displaced persons provides us with a handy test tube in which we can examine whether the proposals advanced to liberalize immigration policy would be fortuitous for this country.

I am certain that testimony with regard to the integration into the fabric of this country of these refugees from totalitarianism has been advanced to this Commission. The splendid effect of this broad-visedioned displaced-persons policy upon our foreign relations has been documented.

It is my purpose, today, to examine the displaced-persons policy against the background of the southern area to attempt to determine whether an enlarged flow of immigrants coming from countries whose residents are normally restricted from journeying to these shores has been and will be helpful or hurtful.

Let us first take a brief look at the South itself, its need, its capacity, its desire to absorb new immigration.

The South is in a period of transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy. The South can no longer be classified as it was only 15 short years ago as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. The South is prosperous and its industry is expanding rapidly. There is great need for more industry, more capital, more technicians, more skilled workers, both in industry and on the farm, as you heard a few minutes ago. The present population cannot fully meet the labor demand. Examine, if you will, the want ads of the daily papers through the South and you will note the tremendous demand for skilled people to man the gears of our expanding economy. No better pool of skilled manpower can be found than if properly screened among the reservoir of those desiring to enter these shores.

Populationwise, as another witness pointed out, the South is far from being overinhabited. There are vast areas that need settlement in order to bring the land to its fullest productivity and fruitfulness. Take an automobile ride in any area of the South and you will note how thinly the land is populated.

A great minister of this city, Rev. Pierce Harris, has on the bulletin board of his church, "And the people are friendly." I think the same thing can be said generally of our southern folk. They are noted for their friendliness and hospitality. The settlement of immigrants under the DP bill caused, as far as I have been able to discover, and my work is in the field of human relations, neither tension nor irritation. Southern hospitality for the stranger within our gates has become with justification a byword in our country's language.

Unfortunately some of the actions of a few of our irresponsible and violent elements have been used with telling effect by the Communist publicists in their efforts to undermine American prestige throughout the world. A cross-burning, a flogging, a Klan parade has been grist for the Red propaganda mill in Asia, in Africa, and in Europe. Effective efforts by the South to curb the Klan through antimask and

anti-cross-burning laws and through the prosecution of Klan leaders have hardly been whispered abroad.

What better way to demonstrate that the Klan and the Klan mentality represent the deviation rather than the pattern than by taking the Klan philosophy out of our immigration laws. The successful adjustment of immigrants in our South has been, and I know will continue to be, a living lie to world-wide Communist propaganda.

In conclusion, may I present to you some figures to illustrate my thesis. These figures are based on the adjustment of Jewish displaced persons in the South.

During the time the displaced persons law was effective, some 6,500 Jews were settled in the southern area. Of this number, according to the United Service for New Americans, the agency which was in charge of settling them, not one has been a recipient of public charity. The average length of time that these immigrants have received private charity has been only 3 months. This represents a period just long enough for the immigrants to become acclimated and to learn enough of the language to hold a job. Almost uniformly these immigrants—these new Americans—have enriched the South through their industry, their culture, their scientific and technical knowledge, and, above all, through their loyalty and devotion to their newly adopted land. Some of these immigrants because of their special talents, have started unique industries which have provided employment and income for thousands of southerners.

For example, take the case of Mr. A, a paint chemist. In partnership with a native southerner, he started a paint factory which offers a highly unique and important service to southern industry. This paint factory is not in competition with other paint manufacturers. As a matter of fact, Mr. A, because of his special knowledge is called in to help other paint manufacturers to solve some of their knotty problems. He has invented formulas which permit the application of paint to machines being operated at extreme temperatures. His factory now gives employment to a number of native southerners. His contribution has supplemented and aided and helped industry in this area to expand.

Other immigrants, trained as doctors, scientists, and physicists have also been extremely useful. There is a tremendous demand for doctors to serve in our rural areas. A number of the new Americans have settled in agricultural communities, where they are performing valued and needed services. One of the greatest needs of all in the field of medicine is for selfless, devoted doctors to serve in State-operated mental institutions. These mental institutions find it difficult for a number of reasons to attract sufficient doctors. A number of southern mental hospitals now have as residents new immigrants. Nor is there any need to detail for this Commission the valued services of the physicists and other scientists who have worked at various southern atom-bomb projects, nor to outline the histories of several uniquely trained scholars who occupy important niches in a number of southern colleges and universities. It is important to underline, however, that there is still a tremendous need for added services in the South—needs which can only be filled by the acceleration of a flow of talented immigrants to these shores.

May I reiterate once more the deep and fervent hope of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith that this Commission hearing will serve to lead to a Nation-wide discussion of how our immigration and naturalization laws and policies measure up against our democratic principles and how these laws and policies can be made to conform more closely to our democratic ideals. Out of this discussion we hope will come a democratic, humane, intelligent, and far-sighted immigration and naturalization policy which will aid in building democracy, not only in our country but throughout the world, and which will enable our country as a leader of the democratic forces of the world to play its proper role in the elimination of want and fear everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Miller.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do you know if there is any State in the South making the same type of study that is being made by the University of Georgia about the adjustment of displaced persons and the type of work they are doing in which they have made some judgment?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir, I don't.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Monsignor, Mr. Holton is still in the room. Maybe he can answer that. Do you, Mr. Holton, know of any university in the South making a study similar to the one the university is making?

Mr. HOLTON. Let me correct that. The university is making that study for the Georgia Displaced Persons Committee. The university is not making that study. Our committee considered the question and unanimously requested the Governor to make available the funds to make that study and then the study was made for the Displaced Persons Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mrs. Hall here?

Mr. ROSENFELD. She is not, but Mrs. Hinton Blackshear is here in Mrs. Hall's place.

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. HINTON BLACKSHEAR, CHEROKEE CHAPTER REGENT, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. BLACKSHEAR. I am Mrs. Hinton Blackshear, Cherokee Chapter regent, Daughters of the American Revolution, and my address is 1237 Peachtree Battle Avenue NW., Atlanta.

Mr. Chairman, may I have that corrected. I am not here in Mrs. Hall's place.

The CHAIRMAN. I beg your pardon.

Mrs. BLACKSHEAR. I am here and was here this morning. I didn't know anything about this hearing until I read it in the paper. I was not notified and I have come absolutely unprepared to make any sort of statement at all.

Mr. ROSENFELD. You know that the State regent was notified at the same time everybody else was?

Mrs. BLACKSHEAR. Well, the State regent is in Washington attending a national board meeting of the National Society of the DAR. I am glad to know that.

I have made a few notes of the testimony I heard this morning. We heard one of the speakers talk about the great need for more immigrants into this country. Personally, I believe that is a misleading statement. One of the reasons was that we can't get our household



equipment repaired because you have to wait for many days to wait until somebody comes to fix it. That seemed to mean that we had a shortage of labor. I don't really think we have a shortage of labor. I think some of the reasons we have a shortage of labor is that people now work shorter hours, do less work in an hour, in a week, and in a month than they used to do. I can cite you one industry, the building industry, where 10 or 12 years ago labor cost was about half of what it is now per hour. But that is not the only cost, and the rise in cost is that the man who used to hang about eight doors in a day now hangs only about four in a day. That makes the cost per hour go up and that is one of the hidden evils we don't see about.

We are fast losing the rugged individual. I don't believe if we take any immigrants into this country to relieve that shortage that they will be the thing we are looking for, because I think after they stay here awhile and see how some of us get by with shorter hours and doing less work within an hour they will also want to take on the American way.

We need to do something at home with our own natives. We used to think about—we of the DAR, to be sure, worked with foreign-born people to make sure they became good citizens. Too long we have worried about the fellow coming in. Now we must be concerned about the native-born. I think that is one of our evils today, our native-born.

We talk about people who are brought over, as Mr. Holton talked about, to do special jobs, farming. I believe definitely in more careful screening. I am not opposed to people coming in. I am opposed to subversives coming in. I think they should be screened more carefully than ever before for the good of this country.

I resent greatly the statement made by Mr. Weisiger this morning when he referred to a patriotic group. I am not sure he was referring to my group, but since ours is the largest group, and we have taken a very active part in all legislation, I imagine that is the group he is talking about. We own a whole block in Washington. He seemed to think we knew nothing of what we talked. We have a counsel. We are there under the eaves of the Capitol, and we do know what we are talking about, and we don't go off half-cocked when we oppose something, and we are 100 percent for the McCarran Act. We are opposed to the Lehman bill. He says he is a retired telephone man, and yet he wants more to come in when his own industry cannot furnish enough telephones for the people we have here now. I don't know if his company wants more people or not.

He (Mr. Weisiger) also said he would be glad to take whole families from European countries, even if the grandfather or father has TB. I say they shouldn't come over here, because we should cure our own aged persons first. I am definitely in favor of us curing our own people before bringing over diseased ones from these other countries. Our own hospital in Rome, Ga., has a long waiting list of native-born. Please, for heaven's sake, let's try to cure our own native-born before we try to cure all of Europe.

I believe those are about the only things I have to refer to. I would like to see us think about bringing our own men home from the armed services to fill some of these professional jobs and some of the vocations that they say we definitely need some more people to come and fill the places. I believe we should have our men back here to fill some of these places instead of having them out fighting the United Nations'

war. I believe that even though 90 percent of the fighting forces are our men they still call it a United Nations war. I believe if a lot of them would go to war for the United Nations under their countries' flags, they would not need nearly as many of them to leave their countries.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Is that a State institution you spoke of, for those who cannot pay, or is it for anybody?

Mrs. BLACKSHEAR. It is a State institution, and I imagine not to be paid.

Commissioner FINUCANE. Is it for everybody?

Mrs. BLACKSHEAR. It is for citizens of Georgia. I am not sure whether they pay or not. It is a State institution.

Commissioner FINUCANE. You don't know whether there are any other institutions in Georgia operated by others than the State?

Mrs. BLACKSHEAR. Oh, there are private ones. We also have a veterans' hospital, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mrs. Blackshear.

Is Mrs. Burts here?

#### **STATEMENT OF MRS. URANSOM BURTS, HONORARY REGENT, CHEROKEE CHAPTER, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLU- TION**

Mrs. BURTS. I am Mrs. Uransom Burts, 3190 West Andrews Drive, NW., Atlanta. I am honorary regent, Cherokee Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution.

I organized the Cherokee chapter. I am a member of the Board of Managers of Wesleyan College in Macon, Ga., the oldest woman's college in the world. I have done civic and patriotic work for a number of years for no pay.

I am not like the gentleman this morning who had an educational foundation to lend money. Some of our girls from Wesleyan have borrowed from that foundation, incidentally, and paid back a very nice interest. My work is not of that type.

I am interested in this McCarran-Walter bill. I have sat in this room and several rooms down the hall for the past 15 or 17 years in Americanization courts. I have watched these persons become naturalized. It has been my business to call upon them at times and also to supply them with a manual that the national society puts out, which you are familiar with, I am sure: The DAR Manual for Good Citizenship. These people who are studying to be good citizens of this country take it and study it. It is published in 18 different languages. There couldn't be any organization in America any more interested in this immigration law than the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The only thing we of the DAR are interested in is the people coming in. We are not against bringing people into this country, but we are against bringing people into this country that we know nothing about. This morning you spoke of bringing in people from southern Italy, and in this particular section you allot so many to this country and so many to that country. If this country doesn't take its allotment, then let's take these from down there.

Maybe these clergymen and these people who are so interested in this free world, this one world—I wonder if they have ever thought

of helping people in their own country. They don't want to come to this country, maybe. Why take the people who are dissatisfied in this country. We don't get those people who are doing well in their country. Yet you want to bring all the displeased ones in, open our gates and let them walk in with no questions.

I, of course, am heartily in favor of the McCarran bill, as you see. I was most impressed this morning with Father Donovan's thought that he advanced: Open the doors into the world at large rather than just into the United States. We sometimes get away from our subject. This is still the United States, I believe, and we are here because our forefathers fought for us. All our ancestors came from across the waters. They came over here to be a free people and they fought for what they thought was right, and we too often forget that their blood is spread from one ocean to the other ocean for that freedom. And if you can tell me how you can take testimony from somebody who has been here 1 year, and incidentally I noticed this morning that he has a wonderful following, and how his opinion could be of any value. He doesn't know a thing about what his subject apparently is supposed to be, other than what somebody has told him to come and say.

So I say to you gentlemen as you tour around—and I wish I had a bunch of questions to ask you. I am like Mrs. Blackshear: I read in the paper that you were coming. There are other questions people would like to ask you. I don't want to leave the impression that we are against people coming into this country, because people are too prone to pick up anything our organization has to say and bat it around, as you gentlemen know. If other organizations had done what our organization has done effectively in the last year—purchasing 48 landing ships in the war—I don't think you can cite me another organization in this country that has contributed any more to the welfare of this country than the Daughters of the American Revolution.

So I just want to go on record as favoring this McCarran-Walter bill, and I believe that is all I have to say, unless you want to ask me some questions, which I probably can't answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much for your statement.

Is Reverend Kleckley here?

#### STATEMENT OF REV. H. D. KLECKLEY, CHAIRMAN, GEORGIA-ALABAMA COMMITTEE, NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

Reverend KLECKLEY. I am Reverend H. D. Kleckley, 1307 Holt Avenue, Macon, Ga., representing the Lutheran resettlement service of the National Lutheran Council, division of welfare.

Mr. Chairman and members of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization: I have prepared an analysis and suggestion for immigration and the naturalization of aliens which I would like to read. May I say that I have not mentioned anywhere in these few pages that I shall present the particular act that has been referred to here so many times. By implication, of course, certain provisions of it are referred to.

It is with pleasure that I take advantage of the opportunity given to me to appear before the commission. Here to present a few con-

clusions that have been reached out of my experience during the past 3 years as a pastor in the church and as an official representative of Lutheran resettlement service of the National Lutheran Council in its division of welfare. Representing this agency I have had the privilege to view the whole question before this Commission from the view point of those who are interested in immigration and from the point of view of those who think we should have our front and back doors closed to all human beings who were born outside the United States. There has also been opportunity to view the situation in relation to people who have come into the country as D. P.'s and refugees, also in relation to people who have come long before (as the need to seek interpreters has been frequent) and has reached to many of our naturalized citizens. I hope that the conclusions that I have reached will be of some help. I shall be brief in stating them, also simple and positive. And may I throw in here that one of the policies of our agency has been to follow the cases that we bring in, where we believe immigration mostly breaks down.

In the time allowed we shall deal with requirements for admission, need (or lack of need) for the admission of more people, and our moral obligation to certain peoples in serious need for resettlement. Under the heading of these thoughts will be presented certain factors directly related to the subject at hand:

#### 1. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION

It would seem that requirements for aliens to enter the United States would in some instances be relaxed in relationship to their present statement. Where there is existent need people should be admitted. (For example, the people who were caught in the pipelines of processing where the need for them in this country had been established. Or where there is general need for immigrants to fit into the economic or social pattern of the State and community.) Provision today should be made for many of the peoples of the world who are brave enough to risk life and division of family for the love and devotion to a cause which is the same as the cause on which this country was founded and lives.

I think there is a crying need for some law that will be flexible enough in its definition to make it possible for an impartial agency of the Government to admit immigrants based upon the need that we have for the services that aliens can fill, and also based on the places in the economy and society that can be found for the solution of the problems that face so many people of the world. Why should the United States of America be free from the absorption of the refugees from totalitarian philosophies of governments under which they cannot live.

The limitations that are set should deal in a limited way with numbers, in a positive way with security risk, and with the impact that immigration can have on world relations.

As near as is humanly possible under our free domestic form of government the whole question of requirements for immigration and naturalization should be divorced from politics. We should recognize that immigration is, as it has been through the years, a desirable and healthy state of normal life for this great country of ours. Whatever policy is to be made permanent in the United States on immigration,

if it is to be successful, must not discriminate against any particular nation of the world or any region of our own country. The present quota system is entirely out of date and should be restated to fit the needs of the homeless and refugee peoples of the world today.

## 2. NEED OR LACK OF NEED FOR ADMISSION OF MORE PEOPLE

It certainly must be remembered that the whole industrial and political and social make-up of the United States will have to pay the debt it owes to the opportunities of past years for the immigration of peoples from all parts of the world to these States. It certainly is not necessary to enumerate any of the heritages which are now cherished by the United States and its citizens that have come to us only because it was possible for the human brains of other countries to come here and be applied to the limitless resources that were, and are, ours. Improvements can still come from the labors and brains of people who wish to immigrate to the United States.

In my humble opinion it can no more be said now than it could 100 years ago that we are at the point where there is not actual need for immigration. In the case of those who were permitted to come in under the Displaced Persons Act and with whom I have had actual experience, I have yet to find one who can be counted as a liability to the country, or to the economy therein. In the area which I have worked (Georgia and Alabama) the real liability in the whole program has been slowness with which the program was permitted to function. And the necessity for all the details (for example every single detail of employment and housing to be worked out on an individual name basis in this country before processing could begin in Europe or some other part of the world). This lessened the interest of the United States citizen in the whole program, but did not lessen the need for immigrants themselves.

Since June of this year I have had requests for over 50 persons who would fit into specific needs. In one case I know of a dairy having been sold completely because there was no prospect of a manager being procured from the DP program even though two separate applications were made, one more than 18 months before the expiration of the act, and in both instances the person assigned was not permitted to leave Europe and come to the job. (There may have been good reasons but there should have been someone who could have been permitted to come.)

There is opportunity in this area in farming, industry, and domestic service. If these opportunities could be filled they would be of lasting benefit not only to the economic structure, but to the social structure as well.

Of over 200 DP's who came into the two States mentioned above under the agency which I represent, according to best record obtainable, 149 of them are still in the same States, and I have reason to believe that more have come into the States than have left. (That is, DP's originally settled in other States.) This in spite of the fact that certain United States citizens have attempted in this area to exploit their labor and that natives from their homelands have been fewer in this region of the country than in certain other regions. This proves to me that there is need for immigrants and that the need pictures of itself the opportunity to the immigrant.

On the question of whether or not recent immigrants have been worthy of help they have obtained from the United States and from its citizens of the States, I would cite two things only. Their sense of responsibility to obligation (evidenced by repayment of transportation loans and by their payments on retail purchase contracts which have been made on such items as automobiles, refrigerators, and other essential items of human necessity and comfort) and also their willingness in many instances to work even on substandard pay for the person or persons who were willing to provide them opportunity by becoming their sponsor.

### 3. MORAL OBLIGATION

I sincerely believe that we as a nation are today morally obligated under the original purposes for which this Nation was founded to extend our immigration policy vastly to care for our fair share of the peoples of the world who have been rendered stateless in their desire to remain free rather than become slaves to totalitarian systems of government. And in this light we certainly need to also restudy our policy on naturalization.

It would seem that the one requirement for naturalization should be the willingness of the individual to accept citizenship and all of its responsibilities. The time element must of necessity be long enough for the individual to prove himself worthy of citizenship and for the individual to learn the duties that are attached to acceptance of citizenship.

If I am permitted to make recommendations they are these:

1. That laws should be amended to make it possible for more immigrants to enter the United States and that the time of entrance should be governed by both the needs for immigrants in the States and the need for resettlement in the nations from which they need to come.

2. That some provision should be made to better educate our own citizens of our Nation to the desirability of having immigrants come into the country.

3. That provision be made at the present time that would permit the reunion of families that have been separated by the inadequacies of our past and present immigration laws.

4. That the over-all need for immigrants in our economy be surveyed as frequently as seems practical.

5. That limitations on immigration be made very stringent where sincerity of purpose seems questionable or where there is serious question of loyalty at stake.

6. That all aliens admitted to the United States be encouraged to become citizens as quickly as possible.

7. That once an alien is made a citizen he be treated as all other citizens and punishment be rendered to him for offenses through our courts and prisons rather than using the channel of deportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Is there a displaced-persons commission in Alabama?

Reverend KLECKLEY. No.

Commissioner O'GRADY. I was thinking about this type of study that—it is awfully important that we have as much of a critical examination as possible of the adjustment of these displaced persons.

That, of course, would not only show how they have adjusted themselves but also the types of occupations they fill, the type of need they fill in the life of the Nation and the problems you would have in their adjustment. Would you agree we need more of that type of study?

Reverend KLECKLEY. I think, in answer to your question, that we do. I would have prepared it had I thought that that information was being sought. On the basis of the invitation that went out, I took it that that other thing was the most important thing to this Commission at this time.

I would like to say in follow-up, if I am permitted to, that we find the aliens who come in are definitely at sea, too—to use a slang expression—in this area of the country because of the lack of knowledge of our language. They need to be taught a speaking and reading knowledge of the language very early. It has been one of the tremendous problems on the farms. That has been mentioned here several times.

In the placements we have made on the farms, in all but about a dozen cases—that is, about a dozen families—where they have moved away from where they originally settled, it has been specifically because—and I say this unreservedly and would be glad to testify to it under oath—there has been an exploitation of labor. The cases where they are being properly paid they are very satisfied and are doing very good jobs. They have them as dairymen. Why, one told me only last week that if necessary he would pay \$400 a month to keep the man he had because he could not be replaced. Many of them are staying. Over half of them who have gone to the farms have left. They have not left the State, but they have left the original farm. Some have gone to other farms and some have gone into the cities.

Another thing that came to my attention recently was that the Retail Bakers Association of Georgia requested 25 professional bakers. They said they could not be obtained in the area or even in the country.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do you think it takes them a long time to learn the language?

Reverend KLECKLEY. If they are under 50 they learn enough in 6 months to carry on an understandable conversation. That has been my experience—if they are under 50.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Aren't many of them already bilingual?

Reverend KLECKLEY. Yes. They can probably learn ours quicker than we could learn theirs.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Reverend, you recommend that the Commission consider, as you said, an increase in the number of persons to be permitted to immigrate to the United States. Do you have any observations you would care to give to the Commission on how these people should be chosen, within whatever ceiling is fixed?

Reverend KLECKLEY. You are talking about numbers for the whole United States?

Mr. ROSENFELD. Assuming you have chosen a number that is the maximum ceiling number, how would you then decide how many you would permit to be allocated against that number? Would you favor continuing in effect the national origins-quota system?

Reverend KLECKLEY. I am personally opposed to the national origins quota system. I think it has no place in the background of our country. Of course, from the standpoint of the fact that from some

regions of the world, because of philosophy of government and so forth, that would have to be included entirely, but they probably won't want to come anyway. The whole question is too deep or me, thinking of the country as a whole, because I am not familiar with the immigration situation in every region of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean this country?

Reverend KLECKLEY. The whole parts of this country. As far as the South is concerned, I see no reason even why an oriental cannot be properly rehabilitated in this part of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you are opposed to the national origins quota system. What, then, would you substitute in place of it?

Reverend KLECKLEY. I think I had in my prepared statement here that I felt like the authority for that thing should be vested in an impartial commission or agency of the Government that would have all the facts at hand as to the needs in our country and as to the existent supply of immigrants from other countries. I think in the light of that kind of thing it has to be worked out. Quite frankly, I think a national origins system of quotas for immigration is just as gross an evil as any political segregation laws of the South, if you please.

Commissioner O'GRADY. Do you think we can have an effective international policy without facing the problem of the homeless and uprooted peoples?

Reverend KLECKLEY. Well, unfortunately, as you men surely know, and I believe this is true everywhere, there is a vast difference in the opinion of a people as expressed politically-wise, on the one side, and humanitarianwise on the other. But generally speaking, I think there is an element in both of friendliness toward the new neighbor, as they have been called many times, people from many parts of the world. I think in many channels of politics that is to be found in spite of the accusations otherwise many times.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is Mrs. Henry W. Moore here? I understand she is the vice president of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Moore asked me to say, if she was not able to get back, that she would like to have permission, on behalf of Mrs. Martin, who I take it is the president of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, to submit a statement to the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. That permission is granted.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by several people to have included in the record of the Commission their statements: Mrs. Walter Feldman, 1395 Euclid Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Norman H. Cain, 2045 Ponce de Leon, N.E., Atlanta, Ga.; and Mrs. E. E. Twiggs, 640 Ponce de Leon, Decatur, Ga.

The CHAIRMAN. They may be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statements follow:)

#### STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MRS. WALTER FELDMAN

Having confidence in Senator McCarran and the Congress of the United States, I want this law to remain intact. (Mrs. Walter Feldman, 1395 Euclid Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.)



## STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MRS. NORMAN H. CAIN

My name is Mrs. Norman H. Cain. My residence is 2045 Ponce de Leon NE., Atlanta, Ga. I represent no one but myself, the mother of three sons who defended this country in World War II. Having read the 14 volumes of the McCarran committee on the Institute of Pacific Relations, I am convinced this Nation is so seriously threatened from within and without, that our only protection is in such a bill until conditions are more stable. I listened carefully to the statements this morning and found no apparent concern with political affiliation except to object to the present restrictions. Therefore am in complete agreement with the provisions of this bill—stringent though they are. The times demand it. (Mrs. Norman H. Cain, 2045 Ponce de Leon NE., Atlanta, Ga.)

## STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MRS. E. E. TWIGGS

During the depression I did social work among all nationalities in Detroit, Mich. There was no discriminating as to creed or color.

I feel that our Congress is able to confirm such laws as we need, since they are chosen by the people of all States, not by a disgruntled group, such as seems to be the ones holding this meeting. (Mrs. E. E. Twiggs, 640 Ponce de Leon, Decatur, Ga.)

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anybody else?

Mr. ROSENFELD. No other person asked me to testify, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anybody here who wants to make a statement?

Mr. WHITE (from the floor). Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my personal views about the matter although I didn't come down here to talk.

## STATEMENT OF O. LEE WHITE, MEMBER, GEORGIA FRATERNAL CONGRESS

Mr. WHITE. I am O. Lee White, attorney, Healy Building, Atlanta, Ga., and member of the Georgia Fraternal Congress.

I am not speaking for the Georgia Fraternal Congress, but of the opinions of people I have heard who make up that organization. The Georgia Fraternal Congress is made up of all the fraternal insurance societies doing business in Georgia. They represent approximately 600,000 fraternal businesses in this State.

Some of those organizations believe in restricting immigration. I know you are familiar with the fact that the Junior Order, United American Mechanics, an affiliated organization, and the DAR have been opposed to letting down the bars of immigration for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. They have appeared before us in other cities.

Mr. WHITE. As I say, I am not speaking officially for the organization. At their last meeting in Rochester, Minn.—I didn't attend their last quarterly meeting. We do have an annual meeting tomorrow, and it was my idea to come here and get some idea of what the testimony was like this afternoon so I could talk to them about it tomorrow. That prompted me to come here.

Personally I am opposed to letting down the bars of immigration. Personally, I am opposed to letting foreigners come over here and take Americans' jobs. Personally, I am opposed to Americans having their standards of living depreciated by foreigners. I get that opinion, that thought and that feeling from my association with members of the fraternal organizations. I have been practicing law for 25

years. I belong to practically all the fraternal organizations that there are of a Protestant nature.

As an American I have seen Americans go without food. A man came today to me who was going in bankruptcy. He can't make a living for his wife and child because foreigners took his job.

Mr. ROSENFELD. Would you indicate how they took his job?

Mr. WHITE. Depreciated income. Not that any particular person took it. That is the situation, not any particular person. We have seen cotton-mill hands have their labor depreciated. We have seen their jobs go down to 3 days a week. Those things are not just worries and thoughts and fears, but we have seen it happen. I have put many men in bankruptcy because they couldn't pay their expenses, the expenses of their families and themselves. I attribute that, from the information I have gotten, from people coming in here and taking the Americans' jobs.

I stand for America first, last, and always, and I think the American citizen ought to be protected.

As I say, those are my personal opinions.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right, sir. We are glad to have them.

Commissioner PICKER. I would like to ask one question. Statistics of national income per family in various States—and I had not known this before, but the statistics are to the effect that States which have the largest proportion of foreign-born in them have the highest income per family, and the States with lowest proportion of foreign-born have the lowest income per family. I do not know that it is proven that that one is the cause and the other is the effect, but I thought that would be interesting to you in view of the observations you have made concerning the standard of living being depreciated by the admission of foreigners. For instance, statistics show that New York State has the highest per capita income of any State in the Union and it has the highest percentage of foreigners also. Have you any comment you would like to make on that?

Mr. WHITE. You know, I have been over this country a number of times and I have gone through that territory you speak of, out through the Middle West and the breadbasket States of this country through Minnesota and Wisconsin and up in that neck of the woods. I know those States up there have a high income per capita. I know that and I know they have a large number of immigrants. I have no fight on those people, of course, but, as I say, they have specialized agricultural interest.

As you ride up Route 41 or as you go up the Northwestern line and ride the 400 out West you can see those beautiful farms and homes out there. You see the farm house with its big barn, and the barn is bigger than the house many times. You see where they have to have herds brought in at night and through the winter, and they protect those herds just better than they possibly do their families. If you will probably notice, the ground floors of those big barns are made of stone and the upper ones of wood. Very few of those farm houses are actually wood. Those people have a specialized line. As you know, milk trains come by daily and pick up the cans and bring them on down, all through Milwaukee territory. I grant you that you are right about that. I grant you the income per capita in Georgia is low, but we certainly don't want it any lower.

That is the position I take and every time you bring 100,000 people in any country you reduce proportionately the amount of money there to go around on a man's job taken as a whole. I may be completely wrong or prejudiced on the matter, but that is the opinion I have been brought up as a kid to actually see and believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Stanton here?

### STATEMENT OF IRWIN S. STANTON

MR. STANTON. I am Irwin S. Stanton, 6133 South University Avenue, Chicago, formerly 685 Argonne Avenue NE., Atlanta, Ga.

I am one of the so-called second-class citizens; that is, under the McCarran Act.

I would like to say a few words on behalf of the escapees, those people without a country.

MR. RUSENFELD. Excuse me, Mr. Stanton. By your first remark I take it you mean for the Commission to understand that you are a naturalized citizen?

MR. STANTON. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you want to talk about escapees?

MR. STANTON. Yes, in their favor, and just a few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you referring to people who have escaped from behind the iron curtain?

MR. STANTON. People who have tried to escape from behind the iron curtain to find here and in other countries something to cherish more than any native-born, a freedom of thought, religion, speech, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you come from?

MR. STANTON. I was born in Vienna, Austria, and I came over in 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. You were born in Austria?

MR. STANTON. Vienna.

Commissioner O'GRADY. What do you do here?

MR. STANTON. I am a sales representative for a New York house and have been since 1941. I cover in my travels approximately 30 States about twice to three times a year; so, I see a little bit more of the country than the average citizen.

I contact people of all classes and hear all kinds of religious and political opinions.

Commissioner O'GRADY. What kind of business are you in?

MR. STANTON. I represent a canned-goods house, wholesale canned goods.

Commissioner O'GRADY. You cover how many States?

MR. STANTON. I cover approximately 30 States.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty?

MR. STANTON. Yes. I spend about 11 months on the road.

The CHAIRMAN. You travel from State to State?

MR. STANTON. So to say. I cover the territory from New York as far west as El Paso and as far south as Miami and the entire Gulf.

The whole sentence I want to say is that the escapees are people without a country, and in the Southeast and in the Southwest we have a country without people. The country is hungry for people to be settled there, and they don't have to be farmers. New cities are to be

built, too, besides a new farming country to be developed. If we could open the barriers for those people more liberally, the wealth of the States, the opportunity of jobs to make money, to make an honest living would be increased.

They would be just as much of an asset as all of the refugees who came over here before and who were praised so highly before this Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to make a statement?

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. ILNER SPANN MILLER

Mrs. MILLER. I am Mrs. Ilner Spann Miller, 1109 West Peachtree, Atlanta, Ga.

I do not represent anybody but myself, though the Atlanta Council of Churchwomen has a great many women in it who agree with my position, which is: We are opposed to people being brought in here as to origin, race, and color. In other words, we feel that that ought not to be the reason. The reason should be one of skills and of needs. That's the first point I would like to make.

The second point is that I think America has a definite responsibility to take a quota of these people whom the world is having to take, and I think we, with the amount of territory and the amount of unfarmed land we have, certainly have a place for a proportionate number of foreigners who need homes and need places to live.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you saying that you think that people ought to be admitted first on the basis of needs in this country?

Mrs. MILLER. First on the basis of needs.

The CHAIRMAN. And, secondly, if I understand you correctly, on the basis of needs of the individual people who are displaced or who are expellees, from the humanitarian angle?

Mrs. MILLER. To fill the needs we have here for them.

The CHAIRMAN. And would you do so without regard to country of origin and race?

Mrs. MILLER. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any definite ideas as to the total number of people you think should be admitted?

Mrs. MILLER. No; I couldn't, Mr. Chairman. That is something that requires expert knowledge, but I don't think it requires expert knowledge to realize that there is a very definite relationship between good feelings with other countries and our immigration laws and good relationships—now, I just won't even say "good feelings," but between other countries and immigration laws—

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, are you saying it has a definite effect on our foreign policy and on our foreign relations?

Mrs. MILLER. It does have a definite effect on our foreign policies.

Now, I couldn't say I would be against the McCarran bill without really having known more about it, but I certainly would be against those discriminatory features of it that I have heard about today.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Morris Cohen, did you wish to testify?

## STATEMENT OF MRS. MORRIS COHEN

Mrs. COHEN. I am Mrs. Morris Cohen, 1748 Pelham Road N.E., Atlanta, Ga.

I am making this statement for myself, but I would like to say that I represent Hadassah and many women in the group who also feel as I do, but I am speaking for myself.

I would like to go on record as being opposed to the discriminatory measures of this McCarran bill. I would like to say that we in America must realize that we have an obligation to all of these people who are trying to flee the iron curtain, and we certainly cannot fight communism with money and military means without opening our doors as a haven to those people that we try to encourage to escape. I am very opposed to the racial issues and the other discriminatory features of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Does anyone else wish to testify?

Mr. ROSENFELD. There is no one else, Mr. Chairman.

May I request that the Atlanta record remain open at this point for the insertion of statements submitted by persons unable to appear as individuals or as representatives of organizations or who could not be scheduled due to insufficient time.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

This concludes the hearings in Atlanta, Ga. The Commission is now adjourned until it reconvenes in Washington, D. C., at 9:30 a. m. October 27, 1952.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the Commission was adjourned to reconvene at 9:30 a. m. Monday, October 27, 1952, at Washington.)

## STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY OTHER PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE ATLANTA AREA

(Submitted statements are as follow:)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY GUY J. D'ANTONIO, ATTORNEY AT LAW AND FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE LOUISIANA STATE DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

403 MARINE BUILDING,  
New Orleans, La., October 10, 1952.

MR. HARRY N. ROSENFELD,  
*Executive Director, President's Commission on Immigration  
and Naturalization, Executive Office, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much for your letter of September 24 inviting me to present my views to the Commission at the hearing in Atlanta, Ga., on October 17, 1952.

As former chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission for the State of Louisiana, and as one interested in immigration, I have come in contact with many persons who feel that the national-origin quota system should be revised and that the immigration and naturalization laws should be liberalized within reasonable limitations, and geared to our own needs and capacity for absorbing immigrants into our national economy, but with provisions for thorough screening of persons coming to the United States. This would relieve the economic stress of some of the European countries to which the United States has given aid. A great many of these countries are overpopulated, and bursting at the seams. Our aid is only temporary, and does not get to the basis of the problem.

It is felt that if more persons are permitted to enter the United States it would relieve the economic problem whence they came, as well as infuse new blood into this country.

I regret very much that it will be impossible for me to appear personally at the meeting, and will ask that you present this statement to the Commission.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) GUY J. D'ANTONIO.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY SAMUEL WILLIAMSON, ATTORNEY AT LAW, HOUSTON, TEX.

HOUSTON, TEX., October 13, 1952.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,  
*Executive Offices, Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: It is respectfully suggested that there be considered by the Commission a procedure whereby an alien, newly naturalized, and with name changed as part of naturalization, be permitted to obtain a certificate attesting to such change of name.

Inasmuch as no provision is made for the issuance of certified copies of the certificate of naturalization nor for certificates attesting to the change of name, it has been necessary for me to go through the process of changing name in a State court in order to obtain necessary certificates. This places an unnecessary burden and expense upon a new citizen whose business requires him to present proof of change of name in connection with real-property ownership, stock transfers, matters respecting insurance policies, and the like.

If the report of the Commission should finally be published, and the publication be made generally available to the public, I would like to be advised.

Thank you for your courtesy and cooperation.

Your very truly,

SAMUEL WILLIAMSON.

## STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY RUDOLF HEBERLE, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LA.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,  
*Baton Rouge, La., October 17, 1952.*The PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,  
1742 G. Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In compliance with our telephone conversation of October 16, I am sending you under separate cover a copy of my paper on Displaced Persons in the Deep South. Recent inquiries in one of the communities where DP's were interviewed in the spring of 1950 confirmed our conclusion that after some time of shifting about a considerable proportion of the DP's who were directed toward this region have settled down and are becoming integrated into the local communities. In some cases, DP's who left Louisiana in pursuit of better opportunities in the North have returned to their sponsors in this State. In view of the progress of mechanization and diversification in southern agriculture and also in view of industrialization in this section, it seems safe to assume that the opportunities for DP's will increase rather than decrease.

Concerning immigration policy in general, I am of the opinion that the quota system has become quite unrealistic. It is based upon false and antiquated beliefs about ethnic or racial differences in adaptability to American culture, and it prevents the immigration to this country from areas of greatest population pressure.

Recent legislation which aims at the protection of this country against infiltration of subversive elements has created obstacles to the immigration of individuals who would be highly desirable additions to our "human resources" and it has also created hardships for persons who have found in this country a refuge from political persecution. I know of cases of non-Communist refugees from satellite countries in eastern Europe who have been faced with the possibility of deportation merely because of some technicality concerning their immigration status.

This legislation should be revised under careful consideration of experiences with its actual operation.

The procedure of naturalization could be simplified; it should also be adapted to present-day conditions of life. For example, present requirements concerning residence as well as those concerning witnesses result in great and unnecessary difficulties for applicants whose occupation compels them to do a great deal of traveling. That persons who want to change their immigration status from a temporary to a permanent status should have to spend time and money in Canada or Cuba seems to me a perfectly ridiculous and probably unwanted result of deficient legislation.

I regret that I could not appear at the Atlanta hearings, but I hope these statements will be of some use to the Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

RUDOLF HEBERLE,  
*Professor of Sociology.*

(Dr. Heberle's study of displaced persons in the South is as follows:)

DISPLACED PERSONS IN THE DEEP SOUTH<sup>1</sup>

(By Rudolf Heberle)<sup>2</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The DP program represents a new phase in immigration to the United States. For the first time we have a policy of regulated immigration. We select from

<sup>1</sup> Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, May 1951.

<sup>2</sup> Louisiana State University.

## ABSTRACT

The resettlement of displaced persons from eastern Europe on sugar and cotton plantations in Louisiana and Mississippi presents serious problems of accommodation and adjustment. This paper reports the findings of a study made during the first year of the program. It shows the demographic characteristics of DP's scheduled for the two States and describes their conditions of work and living. The conclusion is drawn that a considerable proportion of the DP's appeared to be well accommodated. The success of their resettlement is believed to be largely due to the fact that mechanization and diversification of agriculture in the region result in a demand for that kind of labor which the DP's represent.

the DP's in Europe those who appear to be the most useful to this country, and we attempt to direct the selected immigrants to localities where jobs are waiting for them.

For the South, the DP program created quite new problems. The great bulk of the DP's who came to the United States are natives of eastern Europe.<sup>3</sup> Previous immigration from that area of Europe to the South had been almost negligible, even in Louisiana. In 1940 the two States of Louisiana and Mississippi contained less than 1,000 natives of the three main countries of origin of displaced persons; in both States together were about 6,700 persons whose mother tongue was or had been an eastern European language. Very likely a large proportion of these were Jewish people; but there lived along the Gulf coast several hundred Slovenian fishermen and citrus growers from what is now the Adriatic coast of Yugoslavia, and a large group of Hungarians in the strawberry area north of Lake Pontchartrain (tables 2 and 2a).

The DP program was to bring, for the first time, large numbers of Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, and Ukrainians to the Deep South. The question arose: how would these eastern Europeans be received by the local people, and how would they adjust themselves in a region where they had scarcely any kin and countrymen.

Moreover, it was announced that the new immigrants would be resettled on cotton plantations in Mississippi and north Louisiana and on sugar plantations in south Louisiana; and, in fact, the majority of DP's arriving in these States were resettled in the plantation areas. Anybody familiar with the social and cultural background of the DP's could foresee that their adjustment to the plantation society of the lower Mississippi Valley would not be a painless process.

Estonia and Latvia had undergone an agrarian revolution in the years after World War I. The large estates owned by a German ruling class were expropriated and divided among the Latvian and Estonian peasants; the same process occurred in Lithuania where the Polish landowners were **expropriated and a broad class of Lithuanian family-farmers came into existence.**

Although there was no radical land reform in Poland, it could be assumed that many of the Polish DP's would come from family farms. This proved to be true, especially in the case of the Ukrainians from southeastern Poland.

How would these people adjust themselves to the plantation economy and to the biracial society of a subtropical country? Even those among the Poles who had been working as wage laborers on large estates in Poland or Germany were certainly not accustomed to the share-cropper system nor to the housing standards of colored plantation workers. How would they react to the "furnish" system, to working in gangs, eventually side by side with Negroes: how would they adjust to the climate, to the food, to the relative isolation of plantation life? These considerations led the author of this paper to undertake a study of the DP's in the two States, which was carried out largely by Mr. Dudley S. Hall as a thesis for the Master of Arts degree under the auspices of the *Institute of Population Research* in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University.

The plans for this study had scarcely been laid when a great deal of unfavorable publicity was given in the press to the conditions under which the new immigrants were living and working. Some clergymen criticized the conditions severely, representatives of Polish and Lithuanian organizations descended upon the plantations and in some cases induced entire colonies of DP's to leave. For a while it looked as if the program were doomed to complete failure in this region.

In reading the newspaper reports of that time one cannot escape the conclusion that many mistakes had been made during the first months of the program's operation. The screening had not always been effective so that people with little or no experience in farm work came along with bona fide agricultural workers. The sense of responsibility was not too strongly developed among the first arrivals, many of whom had no intention to stay in the South and joined their countrymen in the East and Middlewest at the first opportunity. Some of the planters and managers of large plantations, on the other hand, seem to have believed they could offer the newcomers the same conditions of housing and employment which they were accustomed to give their Negro workers. Possibly this belief arose from the fact that German prisoners of war

<sup>3</sup> The term "displaced persons" (DP) is used throughout this study, because the immigrants to the States of Louisiana and Mississippi under the Displaced Persons Act at the time of the study were practically all displaced persons in the technical sense; it is possible that among the more recent arrivals have been some expellees of German ethnic origin.



had been housed in rather primitive fashion on plantations and yet proved to be good and willing workers.

In some cases there may have been intentional and malevolent exploitation, although it seems more likely that ignorance of the DP's cultural and social background was the most frequent reason for inadequate treatment.

In any case, all the parties involved learned their lesson quickly: The screening improved, the voluntary agencies issued instructions to individual sponsors, and the latter themselves saw soon that Poles and Latvians could not be treated like native labor, and the DP's arriving later had perhaps a more realistic mental image of their new home than the early arrivals.

From the outset it was clear that the study would have to be restricted to the objective factors which might affect and influence adjustment and to the objective conditions of life and work among the DP's.

A study of the psychological adjustment processes, of attitudes and of changes in values and norms of conduct could not be undertaken at this time and with the resources at our disposal.

## II. DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

### 1. *Methodological difficulties*

The first question to be investigated was: Whether the incoming groups of new immigrants would show any demographic characteristics which might affect their adjustment in the new social and cultural environment. Theoretically, the assimilation of immigrants is most easy for the very young and most difficult for the very old; however, an immigrant group consisting only of children—orphans, for example—would obviously present serious difficulties of adjustments; an immigrant group consisting mainly of single men, as we know from past experiences, will be faced with special adjustment problems, and so forth.

All demographic characteristics which might have bearing on cultural differences and social distance between immigrants and natives were regarded as relevant. Data on these characteristics were obtained from the nominal rolls which the United States Displaced Persons Commission was kind enough to provide. From these lists were taken the names of persons whose destination, as given in the rolls, was in Louisiana or Mississippi. We expected to interview as many of these individuals as possible; we thought, however, that at least 6 months should have passed since their arrival before they could be approached with prospect of satisfactory results. As we planned to begin interviewing in the spring of 1950, we stopped taking cases from the rolls by the end of September 1949. By this time we had covered about 2,000 cases, fairly evenly divided between Louisiana and Mississippi. When the interviews began, we discovered that many of the individuals covered by our data were no longer in the region, or had never arrived. This, we feared at first, would invalidate the entire demographic analysis. Fortunately we were able to obtain from the Louisiana Displaced Persons Commission data covering confirmed arrivals through March 1950. The demographic structure of this universe proved to be similar enough to the nominal roll cases to justify the use of the latter—as far as proportions or percentages are concerned. More recently we obtained from the same source data on all scheduled arrivals from 1949 through March 1951, which will be used to some extent in this paper.

It should be stated that we have no exact information about the number of DP's actually living in the two States at the present time.<sup>4</sup> On the basis of a very rough estimate it is possible that two-thirds of the scheduled DP's actually stayed in the two States; a more conservative estimate would be about 60 percent.

### 2. *Demographic characteristics*

By the end of September 1949, about 2,000 DP's had been directed for resettlement to the States of Louisiana and Mississippi. They came from 13 countries in Europe; however, nine-tenths came from the 3 countries of Poland, Latvia, and Lithuania (tables 1 and 1a). In evaluating these data which refer to citizenship, it should be recalled that each Eastern European state had its national minorities. These were Russians and Lithuanians in Latvia, Latvians in Lithuania, Lithuanians in Poland, Poles in Lithuania, and so forth; German minorities existed in all countries of Eastern Europe. From scrutinizing the family names on the nominal rolls we gained the impression that the majority of the DP's in the two States belong to the predominating ethnic

<sup>4</sup>No check-up on the DP's could be carried out, partly because the administrative machinery was lacking and partly because all agencies concerned felt that the DP's should be left alone in order not to disturb their adjustment.

groups in their country of origin so that citizenship and nationality are in most cases identical; the major exceptions are the Ukrainians from Galicia who appear in our statistics as Poles. This is sociologically significant because of the difference in languages and because of the animosity between the two nationalities.

TABLE 1.—*Displaced persons in Louisiana and Mississippi by citizenship, September 1949*

	Total		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	2,039	100.00	1,078	100.00	961	100.00
Poland.....	893	43.80	751	69.66	142	14.77
Latvia.....	733	35.90	42	11.78	691	71.90
Lithuania.....	197	9.70	127	3.89	70	7.28
Other.....	216	10.60	158	14.65	58	6.03

TABLE 1 (A).—*Displaced persons in Louisiana by citizenship, 1949 and 1951*

	1949		1951	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	1,078	100.00	1,243	100.00
Polish.....	751	69.66	1,951	68.62
Lithuanian.....	127	11.78	233	8.19
Latvian.....	42	3.89	164	5.76
Other nationalities and stateless.....	158	14.65	495	17.44

<sup>1</sup> 278 persons of unknown nationality not included.

The second important characteristic is religion. In eastern Europe, religious and ethnic differentiations coincide to a large extent, but not without considerable overlapping. Thus the majority of Poles and Lithuanians are Roman Catholics, although there were Protestants and Greek Orthodox in both countries; the Latvians are predominantly Lutherans, although Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholics existed in Latvia; finally in all eastern European countries there lived a numerous and sociologically important Jewish population. Since persons of Jewish faith were very rare among the DP's destined for resettlement in Louisiana and Mississippi—only 30 out of 2,039—during the period covered, they are not considered separately in this study.

Since the sociocultural distance between immigrants and natives can be considerably reduced if both groups belong to the same church, it is fortunate that the three nationality groups were so distributed in the two States that Catholic South Louisiana (French Louisiana) received mainly Catholic Poles and Ukrainians while Protestant Mississippi received mainly Lutheran Latvians (table 3).

TABLE 2.—*Foreign born white in Louisiana and Mississippi by region of origin, 1940*

	Total		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	33,260	100.00	27,272	100.00	5,988	100.00
Main DP countries.....	976	2.93	673	2.46	303	5.06
Poland.....	797	2.39	581	2.13	216	3.60
Lithuania.....	125	.37	68	.24	57	.95
Latvia.....	54	.16	24	.08	30	.50
Other Eastern European countries.....	3,633	9.11	2,243	8.22	790	13.19
Russia.....	1,602	4.81	1,190	4.36	412	6.88
All other countries.....	27,649	83.12	23,166	84.94	4,483	74.86

TABLE 2 (A).—*White population by mother tongue, 1940*

	Total		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	2,617,580	100.0	1,512,940	100.0	1,104,640	100.0
Non-English.....	433,320	16.6	387,740	25.6	45,580	4.1
Polish.....	840		660		180	
Czech.....	620		540		80	
Slovak.....	160		100		60	
Hungarian.....	980		880		100	
Slovenian.....	880		640		240	
Russian.....	1,240		900		340	
Ukrainian.....	160		120		40	
Yiddish.....	1,820		1,280		540	
Other.....	426,620	16.3	382,620	25.3	44,000	3.9
English.....	2,184,260	83.4	1,125,200	74.4	1,059,060	95.9

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States, population, nativity and parentage, mother tongue, table 21.

TABLE 3.—*Displaced persons in Louisiana and Mississippi by religion and citizenship, 1949*

	Catholic and Orthodox		Protestant and others	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Louisiana.....	1,006	93.3	72	6.7
Polish.....	718	95.6	33	4.4
Latvian.....	40	95.2	2	4.8
Lithuanian.....	122	96.0	5	4.0
Others.....	126	79.7	32	20.3
Mississippi.....	308	32.0	653	68.0
Polish.....	125	88.0	17	12.0
Latvian.....	88	12.7	603	87.3
Lithuanian.....	65	92.9	5	7.1
Others.....	30	51.7	28	48.3

TABLE 4.—*Location of displaced persons in Louisiana*

	Scheduled arrivals through September 1949		Confirmed arrivals through March 1950	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	1,078	100.0	1,015	100.0
Six urban parishes.....	283	26.2	277	26.5
Rural parishes in French Louisiana.....	657	61.1	604	58.0
Other rural parishes.....	138	12.7	164	15.5

Contrary to the distribution in the two States of the older immigration from eastern European countries, the majority of the displaced persons were resettled in rural areas (table 4). This is the result of the preference given to agricultural workers, a fact which will be discussed later. However, their distribution by residence was not typical for the entire mass of DP's admitted to the United States of America during the first 9 months. By the end of 1949 about 122,000 DP's had been resettled, 53 percent of them in cities of 100,000 or over, 24 percent in other urban areas, and only 23 percent in rural areas.

Within the two States the largest concentrations of DP's are found in the plantation areas of the Mississippi and Red River Valleys. In Louisiana the

majority are settled in the sugarcane area, in Mississippi in the cotton area of the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta north of Vicksburg. In Louisiana, a considerable number of DP's have been placed in the rice and mixed farming areas west of the Mississippi. Much smaller numbers have been resettled in the upland areas of the two States where family farmers predominate. This may be regarded as unfortunate, but is easy to understand. Planters most likely were more willing to experiment with DP's and the voluntary agencies probably found it simpler to get job assurances from a few planters than from a large number of small farmers. Besides, there had been considerable migration of Negroes from plantation areas.

More recent data for Louisiana indicate no significant changes in this pattern of geographical distribution (table 4).

The factors next in importance for the immigrants' adjustment chances are the sex and age distribution. It is a well-known fact that in unregulated international migration the younger adult age groups predominate and that as a rule there is an excess of men among immigrants. This was not the case among the DP's. In both States, males and females were evenly balanced, the sex ratio being almost exactly 100.0. This was not the typical sex ratio for all DP's admitted to the United States: Among those admitted through December, 1950, it was 117.5.

However, there was a slight shortage of men in the age groups 15 to 35 and an excess of men in the age groups 40 to 59 (table 5). More recent data for Louisiana covering all arrivals through March 1951 indicate only slight changes in the age distribution (table 6).

TABLE 5.—*Age distribution of DP's in Louisiana and Mississippi with age-specific sex ratios, 1949*

Age	Total		Male		Female		Sex ratio
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Total.....	2,039	100.00	1,024	100.00	1,015	100.00	100.9
0 to 4.....	240	11.77	113	11.03	129	12.52	88.9
5 to 9.....	170	8.33	91	8.88	79	7.79	115.2
10 to 14.....	177	8.68	88	8.59	89	8.77	98.9
15 to 19.....	159	7.79	89	8.69	70	6.90	127.1
20 to 24.....	165	8.09	72	7.03	93	9.17	77.4
25 to 29.....	232	11.37	96	9.37	136	13.41	70.6
30 to 34.....	133	6.52	77	7.51	56	5.52	137.5
35 to 39.....	204	10.00	98	9.57	106	10.45	92.5
40 to 44.....	189	9.26	105	10.25	84	8.28	125.0
45 to 49.....	184	9.02	100	9.76	84	8.28	119.0
50 to 54.....	100	4.90	57	5.56	43	4.24	132.6
55 to 59.....	37	1.81	23	2.24	14	1.38	164.2
60 to 64.....	20	.98	10	.97	10	.98	100.0
65 and above.....	29	1.42	5	.48	24	2.36	21.0

TABLE 6.—*Age distribution of DP's in Louisiana, 1949, 1950, 1951*

	Scheduled arrivals through September 1949	Confirmed arrivals through March 1950	All scheduled arrivals through March 1951
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Below 18.....	32.6	37.9	37.33
18 to 39.....	40.0	39.1	40.38
40 and above.....	27.4	23.0	22.28

DP's in contrast to previous immigrant groups comprise a larger proportion of dependent children and also of older persons who are near the end of their occupational productivity. On the other hand, compared with the native white population in the two States, the DP's comprise a larger proportion of persons in the economically productive age groups of 25 to 54 years of age; only the

age groups 15 to 25 and 55 and over are smaller; the former due to the effects of war and forced labor, the latter due to screening. The fertility ratio—children below 5 years of age per 1,000 women 15 to 44 years of age—was 440, or slightly above that for native whites in Louisiana and Mississippi in 1940 which was 385.

Economically, the present age composition of the DP's in the two States is less favorable than that of previous immigrants, but more favorable than that of the native white population, insofar as the DP population contains a higher proportion of persons in the productive-age classes.

Sociologically significant is that about one-fourth of the new immigrants were 40 years or over; these will have comparatively poor chances of assimilation, thought they may accommodate themselves quite well, particularly if living in family groups.

The most striking fact, again by way of contrast to earlier immigrants, is that more than 7 out of every 10 DP's 15 years of age or over were married (table 7). The proportion of married persons is high also in comparison with the native white population.

TABLE 7.—*Marital status of DP's in Louisiana and Mississippi by age, 1949*

Age	Single		Married		Widowed or divorced	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
15 to 19.....	158	99.4	1	0.6		
20 to 24.....	80	48.5	84	50.9	1	0.6
25 to 29.....	33	14.2	198	85.3	1	.4
30 to 34.....	18	13.5	113	84.9	2	1.6
35 to 39.....	11	5.4	189	92.6	4	2.0
40 to 44.....	15	7.9	164	86.8	10	5.3
45 to 49.....	13	7.1	156	84.8	15	8.1
50 to 54.....	4	4.0	80	80.0	16	16.0
55 to 59.....	3	8.1	28	75.7	6	16.2
60 to 64.....			17	85.0	3	15.0
65 and above.....			7	24.1	22	75.9
Total.....	335	23.1	1,037	71.4	80	5.5

TABLE 8.—*Family composition of displaced persons in Louisiana and Mississippi, 1949*

Number persons in family	Number of families	Percent	Number of persons	Percent	Children		Adult family members
					Age to 13 years	Age 14 to 20 years	
2.....	154	28.7	308	17.1	12	13	283
3.....	171	31.8	513	28.4	129	34	350
4.....	132	24.6	528	29.3	197	66	265
5.....	42	7.8	210	11.6	83	43	84
6.....	27	5.0	162	9.0	70	34	58
7.....	7	1.3	49	2.7	29	10	10
8.....	3	.5	24	1.3	14	4	6
9.....							
10.....	1	.2	10	.6	6	2	2
Total.....	537	100.0	1,804	100.0	540	206	1,058

Furthermore, we found that nine-tenths of the DP's scheduled to arrive by the end of September 1949 were travelling as members of families. The composition and size of these families is given in table 8. Again, these findings are in agreement with recent data obtained from the Louisiana Commission, both regarding size of families and proportion of persons being members of family groups (91.34 percent) (table 9). It is likely that most of the DP families have not yet reached their full size.

TABLE 9.—*DP families by size in Louisiana, 1951*

[1 person families not included]

Number of persons in family	Number of families	Percent	Number of persons in family	Number of families	Percent
Total.....	815	100.00	6.....	48	5.88
2.....	225	27.60	7.....	16	1.96
3.....	246	30.18	8.....	11	1.34
4.....	188	23.06	9.....	3	.36
5.....	74	9.07	10.....	4	.49

TABLE 10.—*Occupational distribution of gainfully occupied DP's, 1949, compared with Louisiana and Mississippi whites in the labor force, 1940*

Occupational category	Displaced persons 1949		Louisiana and Mississippi whites 1940	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	822	100.0	810,767	100.0
Farmers and farm workers.....	484	58.9	266,382	32.9
Nonfarm and salary workers.....	277	33.7	307,246	50.0
Professionals and proprietors.....	61	7.4	101,278	17.1

The sociological significance of the marital status structure of the DP group is difficult to appraise. While the shock-effect of transplantation to a strange social environment is most likely reduced for those coming with their own family, the assimilation into American culture may be retarded if the DP's can satisfy their need for association at least partly within the family circle.

The information on occupations of DP's in our two states which was obtained from the nominal rolls is summarily presented in table 10 and compared with the occupational distribution of the white population of the two states. These data have to be treated with a great deal of caution. They do not represent the occupations which the DP's had after their resettlement in this region. Presumably they refer to the usual occupation or the occupation previous to removal from the home country. Some of the DP's may have reported new occupations acquired during their service in Germany, and the younger ones have learned whatever skills they have during their stay in the camps. Most important, however, is that under the DP Act, priority was given to agricultural workers or farmers and to other categories of manual workers. The DP Act of 1948 stipulated that not less than 30 percent of all visas should be issued to farmers and farm workers. This provision worked as an incentive to the DP's in camps to misstate their occupations. Also, many DP's had done agricultural work during their involuntary sojourn in Germany or in occupied territory. In this case they were actually qualified for preferred resettlement, although farm work was not their preferred occupation, and they expected to return to their usual occupation at the first opportunity after arrival in the United States.

In view of these circumstances the very large proportion of farmers and farm workers in our group of DP's should probably be somewhat reduced; it is twice as large as the proportion of farmers and farm laborers among the entire number of DP's admitted to the United States by August 31, 1950.

Misstatement of occupation had a great deal to do with the high rate of shifting among the DP's during the first year of operation of the program. Employers stated that many of those DP's who had left their first job "assurance" on farms or plantations were not really qualified agricultural workers.

However, among those who had actually misstated their occupation were quite a large number who adjusted themselves very well to plantation life and work. There was the case of a Latvian woman of over 40 who had been an office worker in a factory in Riga. She was living in a sharecropper cottage on a very large plantation, working as a common field hand, and stated emphatically that she did not mind the work, at least as a first step. When asked how she could have qualified as a farmer—she was listed as such in the nominal rolls—she answered gaily: "Yes, I was a farmer in Latvia; I owned a farm near Riga," and showed us photographs of the place.

The DP's thus present the curious spectacle of a group of migrants who do not have the tendency to upgrade themselves occupationally. A survey of the occupational distribution of DP's after resettlement would give lower figures for agricultural workers, professional persons, and proprietors and a higher proportion of nonagricultural wage-and-salary workers, because it is the latter category into which many DP's shifted during the first months of their stay in the United States.

According to the nominal rolls only a very small number of the women gave an occupation; most of them were classified as housewives. After arrival in the South, a considerable proportion of the latter became gainfully employed; some in agriculture, some in domestic service, others in many other occupations. Thereby the burden of dependents resting on the married men was somewhat reduced. It should be noted, however, that employment opportunities for white women in Louisiana, and probably also in Mississippi are restricted since the field of domestic service is traditionally preempted by Negroes and since the major manufacturing industries in the two States do not employ women.<sup>6</sup>

Immediately after arrival of the first shiploads of DP's at their destinations in the two States, there began a great deal of secondary migration. Statistical information about these movements is not available. We do not know how many left the region to join larger and established groups of eastern Europeans in the Great Lakes region or in the Atlantic States. "Friends and relatives in the North is a frequent disease among the DP's," said a representative of one of the sponsoring agencies.

However, there is much evidence that a large proportion of those who did not stay at their first job found more suitable employment within the region. This shifting was to be expected; it is a very common thing in all long-distance migration. Had the DP's come on their own initiative and responsibility, it would probably have gone almost unnoticed. But the employers or "sponsors" as they are called had in many cases incurred considerable expense in preparing jobs and homes for the DP's. Some probably regarded their cooperation with the program as a kind of charity. In a few cases DP's disappeared without notice and left unpaid debts behind. In any case the sponsors were inconvenienced. The DP's, on the other hand, who were disappointed with the quality of housing, with low wages, and other working conditions, were inclined to put the blame on the voluntary agencies, on the United States Commission, or on the IRO. Since no field work was done during the first months of the program's operation we cannot judge to what extent the complaints may have been justified.

In the next section we shall discuss the situation as it appeared during the spring and summer of 1950 when DP's, sponsors, and other competent informants in various parts of the region were interviewed.

### III. ADJUSTMENT

#### *Methodological remarks*

By that time a year or more had passed since the first DP's arrived in the region. The individuals who were interviewed had been in the United States for 6 months or more; they represented the more stable elements as distinct from those who had migrated to greener pastures at the first opportunity. In this sense, then, they were a selected group.

The interviews were held mainly with persons employed on plantations and farms. No serious language barriers were encountered since in each family there was at least one person who could speak either English or German. Most of the men and all of the children had a fair command of these two languages. Certain restrictions on the extent and intensity of the interviews were necessary, partly for reasons of economy and partly out of consideration for the new immigrants; it was felt that no questions about past experiences should be asked which could stir up recollections of sufferings and misery; it was also felt that questions should be avoided which might interfere with the subjective adjustment to the new environment. However, some of the DP's talked freely about their experiences in Germany and many expressed opinions about their present condition and future prospects. In establishing contact it was found best to state in simple terms that the junior author wanted some information for his thesis and that the senior author was going to act as interpreter if necessary. In this way the DP's as well as their employers were implicitly advised that we were not authorized by any official agency to hear complaints

<sup>6</sup> Compare R. Heberle, *The Labor Force in Louisiana*. Baton Rouge, 1948.

or to investigate cases of mistreatment. If possible, interviews were held in the home and in most cases in the absence of the employer. The technique was informal, no schedules were taken, but the substance of the interview was put in writing immediately afterward and prepared schedules were used to record objective data. Attention was focused on the present working and living conditions and on participation in the life of the community. Employers were also interviewed and additional information was obtained from various other informants. Some interviews, especially in Mississippi, were held by the junior author alone with the aid of local interpreters.

The interviews covered approximately 265 persons in 70 families, or more than 10 percent of the total number of DP's presumably resettled through September 1949 in the two States. However, the interviewed families do not constitute a statistically correct sample. For various reasons, but mainly because of the high degree of secondary migration among the DP's and their wide dispersion, it became obvious at the very beginning of the field work that no scientific sampling could be attempted; we could be glad if we obtained a sufficiently large number of interviews. For this reason no statistical analysis of the interviewed cases was attempted. Instead, the findings were presented in a series of locality group descriptions.

### *Conditions of life and work*

In evaluating the success of the resettlement program one should keep in mind the conditions in which the DP's have been living before coming to this country; furthermore, one should regard their condition at the time of the interview not as static but rather as the first phase in a process of adjustment.

This becomes immediately apparent when a survey is made of the jobs held by DP's in the spring and summer of 1950. While in the beginning the great majority of those who were resettled on plantations had been employed as common field hands, there was now noticeable a definite tendency to employ them in better paid jobs as tractor drivers, repair mechanics, carpenters, bricklayers, or in various other skilled and semiskilled jobs. This shift had two advantages—higher wages and a greater stability of work. The latter point is important—a major problem encountered on plantations is the irregularity of earnings due to changing weather conditions and to the seasonal variations in demand for strictly agricultural labor. The local workers are accustomed to these periods of involuntary idleness, but the new immigrants who want to get ahead financially as quickly as possible complained strongly about the many days during the past year on which they had not earned anything. On smaller plantations this problem is not so serious since there is always some work to be done by the resident labor force, but on large plantations where jobs are more specialized, it is difficult to solve. The managers of one very large cotton plantation stated that this was one reason why they intended to expand their livestock operations since the Latvians and Poles preferred to work with livestock anyway. In another case a planter, observing that the DP's were skillful carpenters, started a small furniture factory on his place. We are here faced with a phenomenon which has occurred again and again in the history of migration, namely, that immigrants possessing particular skills provide a stimulus to the development of new industries or new types of agricultural production. It seems very likely that in the near future the great majority of the DP's will have advanced into jobs more in line with their skills and abilities.

Housing presented another problem. Although most of the DP's had been living in camps under subnormal conditions, they were not willing to accept the simpler kind of plantation workers' quarters as permanent abodes. In their native culture rural housing standards were higher than those of plantation workers in the deep South. By spring 1950 most of the employers had made efforts to improve the DP's dwellings. Rooms had been wallpapered, windows and porches screened, and leaky roofs repaired. Some planters were replacing the old wooden cabins by concrete block houses, equipped with bathrooms and gas stoves. Usually the DP's did most of the work and were paid for it.

As a rule, the DP families were assigned garden plots large enough to produce vegetables for home consumption. Incidentally most of the families visited had also planted flowers and shrubs around their houses, an indication of their intention to stay and to make a permanent home.

In many cases the employer, often with the aid of other people in the community, had provided furniture and other household implements. In other cases they had facilitated the purchase of such equipment on credit. In this connection it must be noted that the DP's sometimes refused to buy consumer goods on credit for fear of becoming financially dependent. Apparently the notion of



peonage had been conveyed to them and the intentions of the employer were, in some cases, misinterpreted. Signs of financial progress such as possession of radios, second-hand cars, and refrigerators were noted in many households, even in the cotton areas, although the cotton crop of 1949 had been very poor.

Generally speaking, the economic situation of the families visited in the spring and summer of 1950, although far from ideal according to American standards, was at least hopeful. In any case it was a vast improvement compared with their situation in Europe. The level of living of the majority of DP's was also higher than that of most of the native plantation workers. They were paid the prevailing wage rates, but they tended to be in the better paid jobs. They kept chickens, pigs, sometimes a cow, and they were adept at developing additional income from the sale of honey and similar sources. About one-half of the families interviewed in Mississippi had one or the other kind of additional income.

The experiment of transplanting Eastern European farmers into the plantation economy, or to speak in more general terms, into the one-crop areas of the deep South, could very easily have resulted in complete failure. Fortunately, the new immigrants came into this region at a time of important changes in the agricultural system; the trend toward diversification has been reinforced during the war and postwar years; cattle grazing and dairy farming are on the increase. At the same time, mechanization is progressing. In this situation, the DP's with their tradition of diversified farming and their mechanical skills fit excellently the changing labor demands. It is quite possible that the availability of this new type of workers will speed up the tempo of change in the region's agriculture.

Furthermore, there are the general effects of industrialization and urbanization in combination with a considerable increase in wealth. The deep South today is very different from what it was 15 years ago. The DP's are thus coming into a highly dynamic economic situation and it is to be expected that they will not only benefit by it but also contribute on their part to the further increase in prosperity in the region.

We shall now briefly discuss the social adjustment of the new immigrants in noneconomic respects.

It should be understood that except for a very few extremely large plantations where more than 20 families were located, the DP's were not resettled in large clusters. Two, three, or five families on one plantation was rather the rule. Thus, there arose the problem of neighborhood relations and of participation in the life of the larger community.

In the Catholic area of French Louisiana, the employers, under instructions from the priests who represented the sponsoring voluntary agency, made every effort to aid the DP's in becoming socially integrated into the local community. They took the DP's to church, to the movies, to the community dances and similar affairs. The children were enrolled in the local schools, and in some cases, special instruction in English had been provided for them. By the summer of 1950 this seemed scarcely necessary any longer. In one French community, the first marriage between a young Pole and a local girl had taken place.

The situation in Mississippi was different insofar as the Latvians are Lutherans and had, therefore, to establish their own church organization.

There are in Mississippi a few areas in which large numbers of DP's are located. For example, within a 20-mile radius from Senatobia, Miss., about 400 Latvians were resettled by summer, 1950. Here a real community has developed whose institutional center is the Lutheran congregation which was organized in the fall of 1949. With the aid of the United Lutheran Council, a Latvian displaced pastor was appointed and a church building acquired; cooperating in the renovation of the building the Latvians developed a high degree of group solidarity. The church has since become the center of the Latvians' group life. There are in Mississippi at least two smaller groups which have developed into little communities, not in a spatial but in a sociological sense, having their social center in the Lutheran church. In Louisiana such local group integration was less noticeable. Here the Catholic Church constitutes a strong bond between the native people and the newcomers; the latter are more easily integrated into the larger native community.

A few cases were observed of a single DP family placed on a small farm in relative isolation from neighbors; it seems that as a rule these placements were not successful. Too much depends in such cases on personal relations between the DP and his employer, and the lack of fellowship with members of their own nationality is likely to put the DP's into a state of tension which can easily lead

to a deterioration of relations with the employer. Some of these employers thought of themselves as benefactors and expected small services from the DP or his wife without remuneration. The DP's who most likely had been exploited a great deal during their sojourn in Germany defined the situation differently, and out of such misunderstandings arose friction and conflict. In some of these cases the sponsoring agency had to intervene and find another place for the DP.

In interpreting cases of this kind one should realize that many planters and white farmers in the region are accustomed to dealing with persons belonging to the class of agricultural workers in a quasi-paternalistic way; they are quite willing to extend favors to their workers, but they expect some unpaid-for services in return. The DP's, on the other hand, who had been exposed to much abuse and exploitation, would of course be very much on their guard against any real or imagined unfairness on the employer's side.

The employers on their part generally regarded the DP's as highly competent, reliable workers. They stated that the new immigrants, once they had understood their task, needed much less supervision than native Negro workers; they took better care of machines and implements. In fact, one employer remarked, "They are such darned perfectionists."

In summary one might say that after a period of 12 to 15 months of operation, the resettlement program had proved more successful than we expected. The anticipated difficulties had arisen but had been solved, to a large extent, by adaptation.

New homes, a new start in life had been provided for several thousand people who but a few months before were stranded in a hopeless situation among an impoverished and often hostile population in Germany. For the first time in many years they were free to move about as they pleased; for the first time they enjoyed the privacy of a family home; they were treated as new members of, and, in most cases, as welcome additions to, the community.<sup>6</sup>

---

#### STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE NORFOLK JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, NORFOLK, VA.

The Norfolk Jewish Community Council represents 37 Jewish organizations, comprising all of the adult Jewish fraternal, philanthropic, and religious organizations in this city.

For some years our council has been concerned with the problem of immigration because we are convinced that the greatness that is America has come about because of an immigration policy over the years and centuries which has permitted the talents and strength of people everywhere to help develop our country. These immigrant peoples coming here of their own free choice were in a position to compare and contrast the freedom and opportunity which this country affords with the limitation and rigidity which so often marked the social and economic structure of the country of their birth. Names of America's greats are in large part the names of those of foreign birth. If America is to preserve its position of world leadership, this same opportunity must continue to prevail.

We have also been concerned with our immigration policy for very natural and understandable personal reasons. Many of our closest kinfolk perished in the kaleidoscope of Hitler's Europe and some few of the remainder found refuge in America due to a hospitable American immigration policy. We have watched and guided these newcomers to our shores and have found them to be of the same spirit, with the same values, and with the same potential of service which marked the earlier immigrant stream.

A few years now have passed since most of our recent newcomers have landed on our shores. It is true that our experience in Norfolk is a small part of the whole, and yet our findings with respect to the economic and social adjustment of these people may be of interest to this Commission of inquiry, for in many respects a small community such as Norfolk is a faithful reflection of the experience of the larger whole.

Of the 20 or 30 newcomer families who to our personal knowledge made Norfolk their home following their nightmare European experience, all are now contributing to America. Whereas for the first months our private welfare organization assumed full responsibility for their economic needs, now they are self-supporting. They themselves are fully integrated into the social life of our community. Their

---

<sup>6</sup> For more detail see: Rudolph Heberle and Dudley S. Hall, *New Americans*, published by Displaced Persons Commission, Baton Rouge, La., 1951.

children attend our public schools and, if you will, already speak with a southern accent. None represent economic success stories, yet all are making their way. Some are skilled workmen: a painter, an electrician, a tailor, each taking his place in the ranks. Several serve in the Armed Forces of our country. Some are small-business men; others are salesmen, bookkeepers, and down the line of occupational opportunities. Were they not here, Norfolk's already tight labor market would be that much more acute, and the work of the great Norfolk Naval Base upon which Norfolk's economy rests would be to that degree retarded. These newcomers are good people; they have no record of conflict with the law. They attend night school and look to the day of their citizenship as the brightest moment of their lives. Norfolk and America should be proud that they are now part of us. And this record of achievement is duplicated in the case histories of Norfolk newcomer families of all religious faiths and beliefs.

All of this colors our thinking with respect to immigration policies in general, and the McCarran-Walter Act in particular. The major limitations and weaknesses of this law have been recited to your Commission on numerous occasions over the past weeks. We concur with these indictments in toto. In particular, we wish to underscore the theme that at this critical stage of world history America is seeking by every possible means to maintain and win friends for the democratic way of life. It appears to be incredible foolhardiness to establish a national immigration policy which legalizes a racist theory that one nationality group is better than another—that one group will make better American citizens than another—that Germans, citizens of a country which spawned two world wars, are considered more desirable potential American citizens than the nationals of scores of other countries.

We recognize and accept, although regretfully, that it is necessary for us to impose immigration barriers. The formula for fixing these barriers is not for us to determine, but we do strongly hold that an immigration law can be arrived at which will be consistent with America's internal need and external responsibilities.

We have been pleased to note that the inconsistencies, irrelevancies, and prejudicial aspects of the McCarran-Walter Act have been condemned in recent months and weeks, not only by both major political parties, but by both major candidates for the Presidency. This leads us to believe that our position is shared by Americans everywhere—Americans of every geographic locality, religious persuasion, and social position.

We, therefore, respectfully urge that this Commission on Immigration and Naturalization bend every effort to see that the McCarran-Walter bill is replaced by a fair and equitable immigration law consistent with the best in the American tradition and the American need of today.

---

#### STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY J. L. NAIRN, McALLEN, TEX.

Box 167,  
McALLEN, TEX., *October 21, 1952.*

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,  
1742 G Street N.W., Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Since the signing of the International Executive Agreement with Mexico in August 1949 I have been greatly interested in the problem concerning Mexican nationals who had entered this country prior to that time and have continued to live here since then. My interest in this is both as an individual citizen and also because I served for some time as a member of the Advisory Subcommittee on Mexican Farm Workers, appointed by the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

I believe that the case of these people deserves separate consideration from that of transient wetbacks who cross and recross the river. They are in all respects settlers except that they have no legal rights.

While the Immigration Act of 1917, section 19 (c) (2) (b) provided for suspension of deportation in such cases, under certain conditions, such relief is very seldom granted despite the eligibility of many of these cases.

The conference report on S. 984 (H. Rept. No. 668) recognized the need for some action "in essential justice to the many Mexicans who, because of the closeness of Mexico and the United States and the traditional freedom of movement across the border, may have entered the United States without complying with immigration formalities, but who have been for many years continuous and useful residents in the United States."

The relief intended in that report did not become operative.

The Special Farm Labor Committee, United States Department of Labor, made a formal recommendation, on November 29, 1951:

"That the immigration laws be amended to provide that a Mexican national who has entered this country prior to August 1, 1949, and has lived here since that time even though his original entry had not complied with immigration formalities, be given an opportunity to have his status as an immigrant legalized. These nationals shall not be disqualified by reason of voluntary departures to Mexico for short periods. In cases where they are unable to obtain certificates of birth or baptism the requirement for such shall be waived."

As far as I know, no action has resulted from that recommendation.

The plight of these unfortunate people is indeed serious. Some are single men but many have wives and children who may be either Mexican or United States nationals, or a combination of both. They have long since severed their ties with Mexico and look on this country as their home.

In many instances they are the key year-round workers of farmers in border areas, for which work they are constitutionally adapted. Those who employ them are ineligible to contract workers on a short-time basis under the Bracero agreement which has a serious adverse effect upon the working of that agreement.

The supposition that these Mexicans can return to Mexico and obtain passports and visas to reenter this country is not practical. Some who have tried this course have had to spend comparatively large sums of money to obtain the necessary papers. This, combined with the loss of work days involved, makes such a course quite impractical in most of these cases.

I may say that I have personally discussed this problem from time to time with high-level officials in Washington who are concerned in the matter. I believe that, to some extent at least, they are in accord with my thinking. The thought that the subject would be an appropriate one for consideration by your Commission originates with a suggestion made to me by Mr. Michael J. Galvin, Under Secretary of Labor.

I shall greatly appreciate hearing from you with regard to this. If you would care to have me discuss it more fully I shall, of course, be glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

J. L. NAIRN.

---

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MRS. STRAITON HARD, NATIONAL  
DEFENSE CHAIRMAN, ATLANTA CHAPTER, DAUGHTERS OF THE  
AMERICAN REVOLUTION, ATLANTA, GA.

ATLANTA CHAPTER,  
DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,  
174 PEACHTREE BATTLE AVENUE NW.,  
Atlanta, Ga., November 10, 1952.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,

*President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,*  
*Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As first vice regent and national defense chairman of the Atlanta chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, we wish to be recorded as definitely being in favor of the McCarran-Walter bill.

We kindly ask you to leave the bill alone, as we know the economy of our country is strained and we are having a hard time absorbing them now.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. STRAITON HARD,  
National Defense Chairman.



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06352 477 9



